

The Southern Speech Journal

VOLUME XIV

NOVEMBER, 1948

NUMBER 2

A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

CHARLES MCGLON

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

This is the second issue of the *Journal* under the arrangement made between the Southern Speech Association and the University of Florida by which our publication was considerably expanded. The *Journal* is of tremendous importance to the life of The Southern Speech Association. Through it more than any other agency, the Association is made a year-round organization. It is for this reason that the periodical deserves the support of the entire membership. Certainly each department head should invite all the members of his staff to subscribe to the *Journal* by securing a membership in the Association. Particularly should this be true at the early part of the year when there are many new personnel in the field of Speech in the South. All newcomers should feel at home and a part of their new section by having access to the *Journal*. It might be added that all of the school libraries of the South would profit from the vital contributions of the Association contained in the *Journal*. Why not see that your librarian knows about your professional publication?

As far as professional relations go, there are two additional things that should be said. First, every member of the Southern ought also to be an active participant in his state speech association. Much of the immediate contribution one can make to the advancement of Speech in Education is best done through the local group, or the state association. Plan to attend the next state convention. While there, of course, please do not forget to extend the horizons of those in attendance who are not active in our sectional group. Every S.S.A. member who goes to Waco should be able to take a constructive part in the discussion of the questions, What the State Associations are Doing, and What the Southern Speech Association Can Do to Increase the Work of the State Groups.

The second item of professional relations has to do with the Speech Association of America. The convention in Washington is so planned that everyone of us should have a profitable time there. The relation between the Southern and the S.A.A. ought to be reciprocal. There is much for Southerners to get; there should be much that they can give. The number who hold membership in the S.A.A., and who attend its convention, should show an increase from year

to year. Will it not be possible for you to be one of that number this time?

Now, about the business of the S.S.A. proper. The most important event that has occurred since the September issue of the *Journal* is the resignation of our Executive Secretary, J. T. Daniel. Resigning his position at the University of Alabama to take a place in New York, Mr. Daniel, of course, left a vacancy in the roster of officers of the S.S.A. Because of the nature of the emergency, action had to be taken. There was a precedent for the appointment by your president of Dr. T. Earle Johnson to complete the year in the office of Executive Secretary, the members of the Advisory Board having been informed. Dr. Johnson was already serving as Advertising Manager; and, as the member of the Advisory Board appointed to help set up the new bookkeeping system for the Association, he was thoroughly familiar with the changes there. He was reluctant to take the responsibility of the office, but he graciously shouldered it when pressed to do so under the circumstances. Certainly all of the membership appreciate the fundamental contributions Dr. Johnson has already made to the S.S.A. and which he will continue to make with his assistance in this case.

The work of planning the program for the Convention in Waco, April 4-9, 1949, is progressing. Miss Sara Lowrey, of Baylor University, our host school, has announced the complete roster of her local committee. It includes Glenn R. Capp, Mattie Bess Coffield, Paul Baker, John Backman, Cecil May Burke, Dorothy Hanson, and Lily Russell. Upon these people rests a huge responsibility which everyone who has paved the way for a convention understands and appreciates.

There have been several other steps in the progression of events everyone will be interested in. To relieve Dr. Johnson, Dr. Elton Abernathy has accepted the responsibility for the exhibits of publications and equipment. Dr. B. B. Baxter will be responsible for enlisting representatives from the graduate schools of the country for the special conferences. Dr. C. M. Wise and Miss Leona Scott have agreed to serve as sectional chairmen of Phonetics and Forensics respectively. The wheels are slowly turning; let us keep them moving on to Waco.

But above all else, let us keep our resolution to do this year the best job of teaching speech and those subjects in related areas we've ever done. In this respect, each of us can make a real contribution to the profession and to our students. To help bring this about we have the Southern Speech Association. Without it, the Association will have little to offer.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN SPEECH EDUCATION

CLAUDE E. KANTNER
Ohio University

We are from time to time concerned about scarcities of material goods, or the paucity of our social thinking, or our lack of spiritual concepts, but probably no one here would have the temerity to complain about any scarcity of words.¹ On the contrary, day in and day out, we are bathed in words as enveloping and all-pervasive as the bubbles in a bubble bath. It is in a way appalling to think that we as teachers of speech are actively aiding and abetting this national logorrhea, and I find it a little embarrassing to be here adding my humble contribution to the daily avalanche of words.

For most of us would agree that in spite of all this talking and writing, or perhaps in part because of it, we human beings are not doing too well these days. The rather cocky optimism and complacency prevalent at the turn of the century and up into the twenties has been rather thoroughly dissipated by a serious depression, a second world war, and the present interlude that by force of verbal habit we call peace. Doubt, anxiety, confusion, uncertainty, fear and, I believe, more than a touch of humility seem to be prevailing moods today—sometimes coupled with hope and sometimes with hopelessness.

Yet actually, what are we afraid of? It occurs to me that it is not really our science or its products that we fear—nor our machines, our ships, tanks, guns, flame throwers, poison gases, not even our atom bombs. What we really fear is *ourselves*. Human nature seeks a scapegoat but the fault, I think, lies not in atomic fission but in ourselves that we stand spiritually naked and shivering in apprehension before an uncertain future. We are coming perilously close to *loosing faith in our ability to get along with each other*. Now "getting along" always has been and always will be primarily a matter of communication—of the meeting of minds and cultures through oral and written language. Whether we will or no, we teachers of speech have assumed, by virtue of our calling, a full share of the responsibility for enriching and straightening this communicative process.

Some of us are also concerned with the problem of retaining the best features of our democratic way of life in a rapidly changing

¹This paper, together with the following ones by Sara Lowrey, Elton Abernathy, and J. C. Wetherby, were read at the second general session of the eighteenth annual convention of The Southern Speech Association, Nashville, Tenn., April 9, 1948.

world that daily grows more complicated in its inter-human relationships. We note with concern the increasing concentration of the power of the press into fewer and fewer hands, remembering that while circulation was doubling between 1920 and 1940, the number of daily newspapers was decreasing by 25 per cent. We note, also, the increasing control of radio stations by newspaper chains, the entering wedge of Federal control and censorship in radio, the increasing use of radio time by government agencies to propagandize their programs, the increasing government control of sources of information, and the increasing influence of pressure groups on legislation. All of this is signalized by the relatively recent development of a new profession known as the "Engineering of Consent"—a profession with courses, textbooks, techniques, teachers and practitioners who will virtually guarantee, given adequate time and money, to induce any desired belief in any given segment of the population.

Our vaunted freedom of speech has always carried with it the freedom to persuade the other fellow, but never before on such a large and carefully premeditated scale with the stakes so great. It becomes increasingly important that we ask constantly, "Who is persuading whom? To what end and with what motives?" As teachers of speech we have no choice; we cannot escape our share of the responsibility for seeing to it that "democracy" works.

Someone has said that the present is a race between communication and catastrophe, but surely that person was not thinking in terms of an increase in the physical facilities for communication. Lincoln at Gettysburg in 1863 was seen if not heard by perhaps 15,000 people. Seventy-five years later, Roosevelt at Gettysburg spoke in person to 150,000 people and more than once addressed radio audiences estimated at 50 million. Pericles, Demosthenes, and Cicero in their combined lifetimes doubtless did not speak to nearly as many people as listen to two wooden-headed dummies on any given Sunday afternoon. From Pericles to Mortimer Snerd—the question squarely before us is: *Has the development of a sense of devotion to the common welfare, of high purposes and unbiased motives, of intelligent analysis and reasoned conviction in the speaker, and of informed and discriminating judgment in the listener kept pace with the development of the new methods of communication designed to reach ever increasing numbers of people?* One could scarcely be called an alarmist for feeling that unless there is some corresponding development in us human beings, these gadgets that our intelligence has created may assist mightily in our ruin.

The era of brotherhood-of-man and good-neighborliness with Hottentots and Tibetans that was scheduled to follow the development of our ability to talk in whispers around the world has been strangely slow in coming. Somebody apparently forgot that in order to disseminate brotherhood-of-man it was necessary to have

not only a broadcasting system, but also *brotherhood-of-man*. We have now all the ingredients for our rabbit pie except the proverbial rabbit and, as usual, that elusive animal is difficult to lay hands on. Perhaps a personal illustration will serve to point up our human dilemma. Last summer while sitting outside my front door one late afternoon I heard, quite literally, a voice from the skies. For a moment I felt like some prophet of old about to receive a divine revelation. As I recall, I was somewhat depressed at the time and could easily have used a little heavenly intervention. I waited expectantly for the message to reach me through the clouds. Would it be, perhaps, some fragment of rare poetic beauty, some enduring words of hope and comfort, or a clarion call to courage and high endeavor? It was, of course, none of these. Instead I heard a somewhat nasal voice announcing, "Don't forget the midget auto races tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock." Truly we are led to ponder what it shall profit a man if he learns to speak with the tongues of men and of angels and has nothing to say or, worse still, can only utter viciousness.

It is in the light of this background that I wish to discuss with you some of the past and current trends in speech education and to present for your consideration some ideas as to the general functions and obligations of teachers of speech in this particular day and age. I believe that we work in a field that is closely associated with problems of individual self-adjustment and of relationships between individuals and between groups. I might even confess to some feeling of special responsibility, but let me assure you that I have no intention of assuming on behalf of our profession sole responsibility for solving the problems of the world. These problems appear to be complicated enough that even teachers of speech can, without loss of face, admit frankly that they need help.

In this review of trends I shall go back only as far as 1915—for which you may thank the program makers who set the time limits on these addresses. It was in that year that the "founding fathers" met to form The National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking which you doubtless recognize as the forerunner of the present Speech Association of America—now grown to a membership of approximately 2,900 and having sired in the meantime two affiliated organizations—the American Speech Correction Association, and the American Educational Theatre Association, each of which has almost a thousand members. These figures alone will serve to highlight one fact about modern speech education, namely, its extremely rapid growth during the last three decades. These founding fathers were emerging from one era in speech education and crossing the threshold into a new period of rapid growth and changing concepts.

They could look back for the most part to a period that we now designate as the elocutionary age in speech education—remnants of

which were to linger for many years and even up into the present time. It may be said somewhat figuratively that the father of modern speech was rhetoric and, if so, the mother was undoubtedly expression or elocution which had fallen into some disrepute in its later days because of an over-emphasis on form and mechanics in posture, bodily activity, diction, and voice. We need to remember, however, that there were giants in those days—men like Trueblood, Fulton, Murdoch, and Hamill whose work bridged the span between elocution and modern speech training and whose influence still lives in our textbooks and in their pupils and their pupil's pupils. It is, nevertheless, fair to say that in its waning this period was characterized by an emphasis on speech as an art form, as a medium for the *exhibition* of "beautiful" and "correct" gestures, diction, and vocal quality.

It is probable that the founding fathers, like ourselves, could not see very far into the future and were thus unable to foretell some of the trends and developments that we can now discern clearly in retrospect. We do know, and I think they also were aware, that they were faced with two immediate problems. The first of these was the necessity of gaining academic recognition and respect for a relatively new—although at the same time very old—discipline, and the second was a pressing need for more students. It may well be that this desire for academic prestige among their professional brethren played some part in the very heavy borrowing from every conceivable allied field, the strong emphasis upon scholarly research, and the proliferation of courses, particularly "content" and laboratory courses, that occurred during the early years of this modern period. This period of academic growth deserves more detailed attention, but I am primarily interested here in the changes that have taken place in our concepts of the basic functions of speech and speech training.

The old emphasis on form and beauty rapidly gave way to new emphasis on the personal, utilitarian, market-place value of good speech. In attempting to name this period I have sometimes wondered whether to call it the *Age of Academic Expansion* or the *Commercial Age in Speech Education* since both of these trends were heavily predominant, if not always too well synthesized. This emphasis on the commercial value of speech may have grown in part out of a selfish, though unconscious desire, to attract students, but it was in larger part an honest reflection of the general spirit of the times. Most of us here will recall the emphasis on speech as "the most powerful tool in influencing and persuading others." We sold speech on the basis of its market place and drawing room value and in language not too dissimilar from that used in advertising beauty treatments, piano lessons by mail, and home courses in repairing gasoline engines. "If you want to be popular, take speech. If you want to be a leader, take speech. If you want to be wealthy

and powerful, take more speech." This point of view was reflected in a perfect rash of such books as *Influencing Human Behavior*, *Influencing Human Behavior Through Speech*, *Strategy in Handling People*, and reached the pinnacle of super-self-salesmanship in *How To Win Friends and Influence People*—a book which after all merely carried to its logical conclusion a point of view that was already solidly entrenched in our very best textbooks.

We were very happy for a time teaching the factors of interest, the impelling motives, the basic drives and all those other "insidious" techniques of persuasion for boring from within, gaining the confidence of our victim, and bending him to our will. We were supremely confident that we were sending out students who would be SUCCESSFUL. True, there was some talk of social *adaptation*, but the emphasis was on social *control*. Then one day some unknown teacher of speech had an unhappy thought. Other schools were turning out other students also skilled in the techniques of persuasion who might one day meet and out-technique and out-influence his students. There could be but one answer. We must teach our students how to *resist* the techniques of persuasion. Now at last we had found The Way and could work steadfastly toward that happy day when everyone would take speech and become equally skilled in *using* the techniques of persuasion and in *resisting* them.

Meanwhile we were for the most part strangely silent about any ethical problems that might be involved in speaking. We enjoyed quoting Quintilian's dictum that the great orator *must* be a *good* man, but we were not very specific in helping our students decide just which techniques a "good" man would use and which he should reject. Even in those relatively rare moments when we did speak of the desirability of a "strong moral character" in the speaker, we managed to make it sound as if character, or at least the semblance of character, was important primarily because, like Ethyl lead in gasoline, it gave that plus power to the speaker's ability to *influence* others, whether for the common weal or common woe we did not say.

We were also over fond of Aristotle's rather inane observation that rhetoric can be used for good or evil, which may have stated the question but certainly did not solve the problem. We were occasionally shocked if a prominent public official made effective but dangerous use of the techniques we were teaching in the classroom, but for the most part our attitude was that we were teachers of *speech* and could not and should not concern ourselves with problems in philosophy and ethics—a point of view that now seems a little strange if we really believed that speech was so powerful a weapon as we were advertising it to be. We placed ourselves in the position of a father who gives his boy a gun along with a little lecture somewhat as follows: "Now son, this is a powerful weapon. It can be used for good or evil. You load it thus, you aim it thus, you fire it so. Now run along and let your conscience be your guide."

Nothing remains static, however, and another trend was beginning to make itself felt. It may have grown out of the speech clinic where the inter-relationships of personality and speech are most strikingly apparent. Whatever its origins, there was a rapid spread of the idea that one of the functions of speech training might be to improve "personality" and to foster a more adequate personal adjustment, not so much from the standpoint of achieving power and influence but to promote individual happiness and well-being. You will recall that this point of view gave rise to a prolonged and somewhat senseless "chicken and egg" type of argument in which it was debated, sometimes fiercely, whether one should work on speech for the purpose of improving personality or begin by improving personality in order to achieve better speech.

This point of view did much, however, to lessen the emphasis on speech as a powerful persuasive tool for those few who could use it most skillfully in controlling others and to place more stress on the role of speech in helping the student work out his personal problems and as an aid in his common, every day contacts with other people. The idealized picture of the speaker swaying large audiences, winning the approbation of high powered executives, and guiding the decisions of powerful deliberative bodies began to give way to a more realistic picture of an ordinary individual with personal problems who did a great deal of *listening* as well as speaking, and who most needed help in improving his ordinary daily contacts.

You can easily see that by this time the beautiful damsel, Speech, might well have been feeling a little lost and bewildered. But fortunately there came riding to her rescue on a snow white horse none other than General Semantics—the white horse, of course, being *The Scientific Method* as applied to problems of language. I am sure that I need not tell you how rapidly this gospel has spread throughout our field. It has brought with it an increased emphasis on the role of language in individual self-adjustment and has also, I believe, been largely responsible for what seems to me to be the latest general trend in our field, namely, the emphasis on the role of speech in ameliorating inter-personal and inter-group relations.

I have a profound respect for the teachings and practices of general semantics and have felt for some time that our students should be given a practical, working knowledge of its precepts. I may be pardoned, perhaps, if I do not fully share the enthusiasm of some who appear to believe that *The Scientific Method* is the only avenue to personal adjustment and human happiness and if I do not myself choose to look solely to general semantics for my own personal redemption and for the salvation of a troubled world. Be that as it may, general semantics has made a most important contribution in giving us a clearer insight into the role of words in both *reflecting* and *fostering* human maladjustment and in pointing the way toward a wiser and more accurate use of language.

Each of these various trends has contributed something of value to our field. Like our professional forefathers, we are unable to foresee the future; but there are many signs indicating that we are now in another transition period that is leading to a stronger emphasis on the social responsibility of the speaker and an active effort to encourage the development of *ethical standards* that will stress the moral obligation to use language as wisely, sanely, and accurately as possible in order to facilitate cooperation and adaptation among individuals and groups for the mutual benefit of all concerned.

As I see it, these then are some of the responsibilities of teachers of speech in this day and age. Certainly we shall continue to want our students to have a knowledge of the subject matter of speech appropriate to their special interests and level of work and to be skilled in the mechanics of speaking. We want them to be well adjusted, to have something worthwhile to say, and to be able to express their ideas accurately, interestingly, and persuasively. They should develop critical and intelligent judgment as listeners and a sense of discrimination in reacting to the persuasive attempts of others. They should have also an intelligent comprehension of the complexities of language and its strengths and weaknesses. Perhaps most important of all, we want them to develop a sense of social responsibility that will lead to high standards of sincerity of purpose and honesty in speech. This is asking a great deal, but it does no harm to try. In fact, I think we *must* try.

FREEDOM THROUGH INTERPRETATIVE READING AND EDUCATIONAL THEATRE

SARA LOWREY
Baylor University

After hearing a reading of *The Bomb That Fell on America*¹ by Hermann Hagedorn, someone remarked to the reader, "I congratulate you upon your awareness in selecting that material and upon your freedom to read it." *The Bomb That Fell On America* is, as you may know, an epic poem presenting the problem of peace in the Atomic Era.

Ridgeley Torrence says this poem is, "Of immediate and supreme importance. It supplements for today Emerson's words written more than eighty years ago upon inspecting the Springfield Arsenal—'At first I was struck with fear of all this panoply of war until I recalled that it all rose out of a thought and a thought can melt it away!'"

"Freedom through Interpretative Reading and Educational Theatre." The objectives of these media are one: to communicate through interpreting literature. Communication of an interpretation of life is the objective of every phase of good theatre: stage settings, acting, and offstage sound effects. We are familiar with the idea that reading is not acting, but it is a new idea to some that acting is interpretative reading. The actor interprets the playwright's meaning through the reading of lines.

Our Convention theme is "Freedom Through Speech." We profess to believe in speech as a medium for achieving and maintaining freedom. One basic way of preserving a thing is by using it. Things deteriorate when not used; things of the mind and spirit grow by use. To preserve freedom of speech we must use freedom of speech. We have been passing through, and are still in, a tragic era wherein expediency is often given precedence over speaking one's convictions. Courage to speak one's convictions seems to be a much needed virtue. Interpretative forms of speech offer as great a means of freedom as other speech forms.

We mentioned in the opening of this discussion freedom to read a poem like *The Bomb That Fell on America*. By reading such a poem we advance the cause of freedom. Shortly before the Freedom Train came to our city our morning paper carried "The Freedom Pledge."

I am an American. A free American.
Free to speak — without fear,
Free to worship God in my own way,
Free to stand for what I think right,

¹Hermann Hagedorn, *The Bomb That Fell On America* (Santa Barbara, California), 1946.

Free to oppose what I believe wrong,
Free to choose those who govern my country.
This heritage of Freedom I pledge to uphold
For myself and all mankind.

By reading this pledge we advance the cause of freedom.

Interpretative Speech can give perspective to the audience and to the student of the course. Kahlil Gibran speaks of the mountain as being clearer to the climber from a distance. As we climb a mountain we are impressed with its ruggedness, its steep and perhaps its perilous places. When we view it from a distance these details are so merged that they become a part of the total trend.

There is a similarity here between life and literature. Literature is an interpretation of life. When we experience the reality of life through the oral study of literature we gain perspective. While in everyday life we may become confused by rugged details, when we view life through literature we sense the general trend. We have need of this perspective toward life today. We need perspective toward our progress in freedom.

A mature teacher in a college was impressed with a young English teacher's understanding of life. When student problems were discussed in faculty groups this teacher of literature seemed always aware of the nature of the problem, the applied psychology involved. When asked how he knew so much about life, his reply was, "through the study of literature."

Many of our educators have been concerned lest in our emphasis on scientific and vocational education we may neglect due attention to the humanities. Literature is the great humanity, the study of the human factor. Literature has been called the human side of history. Our students should learn to experience the reality of literature and at the same time to remain objective, detached even. Without this perspective we are likely to lose the freedom we cherish. The great tragedy of our era is our loss of a sense of worth of human life.

Through the study of literature one gains ideals without which the human race cannot progress. It is ideals which lift man above the brute; it is ideals which give direction to individuals and to nations; it is ideals which give us that vision without which the people perish.

In *Peace of Mind* Joshua Loth Liebman says:

Contemporary psychological experiment reveals that man cannot have true inner security . . . without possessing an ideal to imitate, a hero to follow. . . .

Matter—the most important thing in the world? No!
Ideals!²

²Joshua Loth Liebman, *Peace of Mind* (New York, 1946), 191-2.

Great literature is measured by the universality and permanence of the truth it reveals. In one of my classes we were reviewing the philosophy of S. S. Curry and Charles Wesley Emerson. My students were struck by the continual emphasis on the *truth*. The founders of schools of oratory in our country believed that true oratory was dedicated to the truth; their means of achieving great oratory was through the speaking of great literature. "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

The oral study of literature can give us free minds. By speaking the truth as written by men of free minds we are affected by that truth and by their courage in speaking it. Walt Whitman says:

From this hour, freedom!
From this hour I ordain myself loosed of limits and
imaginary lines,
Going where I list—my own master, total and absolute,
Listening to others, and considering well what they say,
Pausing, searching, receiving, contemplating
Gently, but with undeniable will, divesting myself of the
holds that would hold me.

These words contribute to my freedom of thought as I speak them. How often do we witness minds bound by imaginary lines: "Good fences make good neighbors." Like the progressive farmer in Robert Frost's poem I would ask, "Why do they make good neighbors?" Is it not only when there is something to wall in or out? Certainly corn cannot get across to eat my neighbor's apples. "Something there is that does not like a wall." Walt Whitman's lines give me courage to work to tear down walls, and Robert Frost's lines give me understanding of concrete situations where walls are or are not needed.

The greatest thoughts of the great minds are recorded in literature: poetry, drama, biography, fiction. I frequently say to my students, "I feel sorry for the person who has not cultivated the habit of enriching his thinking with the thoughts of great minds." The sharing of those thoughts through interpretative speech deepens the impression upon our own minds and vivifies the ideas for our audiences.

Our freedom is strengthened by close association with those who had the courage to speak their convictions. As Emerson said, "God will not have his truth made manifest by cowards." By interpreting the truth as spoken by free minds we learn how to be truly free.

The speaking of literature gives outlet and direction to the emotion. Modern psychologists believe it is essential for one to have outlet for emotion. Liebman says:

For the terrifying truth about emotion is this: unless it flows and gushes freely, it will choke the soul that produces it. Yes, your soul as well as mine—because there never existed a soul that did not yearn to overflow with natural emotion. . . .

Have we not been guilty of the same error in oral interpretation? Mr. Liebman continues:

No wonder life began to be more shallow and humanity began to be more callous and insensitive! . . . The result was that the emotions were captured by pervers and tyrants. The dictators of our age, recognizing that human beings become invalids on a diet of abstract science invaded the sphere of the emotions with their death dances and blood symbols. . . . They fed the hungry spirit of man with poisonous food, but with the food—the food of emotion.⁴

Revolting against this undisciplined emotionalism, they [the Orthodox Churches] went to the other extreme and built chilly meeting houses upon the cold pillars of abstract reason.³

Again, Liebman says:

The truth should be obvious now that when no legitimate outlet is provided for the emotions of men, they will seek illegitimate outlets. . . .

It is the dynamic energy which vitalizes every aspect of culture, every creation of civilization. Emotion is not something shameful, subordinate, second rate; it is a supremely valid phase of humanity at its noblest and most mature.

True emotion must not be allowed to run wild. It must be channeled and disciplined but it should no longer be regarded as the poor relation, a slavey in the kitchen of life. Emotion is the prince.⁵

Harness emotion to reason "and a new era of freedom and happiness will come to the earth."⁶ This harnessing of emotion to reason is the essence of good theatre and effective oral reading. Einstein believes that we must use such directed emotion if we are to prevent the war he believes would destroy civilization. In an article in *The Atlantic Monthly* entitled, "Atomic War Or Peace," he states:

³*Ibid.*, 195.

⁴*Ibid.*, 196-7.

⁵*Ibid.*, 197.

⁶*Ibid.*, 198.

The atomic scientists have become convinced that they cannot arouse the American people to the truths of the Atomic Era by logic alone. There must be added that deep power of emotion which is a basic ingredient of religion.⁷

Poets and dramatists through the ages have given us this deep emotion, and it has had effect in the lives of the people. Who was it that said, "Let me write the songs of a nation and I care not whom makes its laws?" It was O'Shaughnessy who said in an Ode,

We are the music-makers,
And we are the dreamers of dreams,
Wandering by lone sea-breakers,
And sitting by desolate streams;—
World-losers and world forsakers,
On whom the pale moon gleams:
Yet we are the movers and shakers
Of the world forever, it seems.

What contribution can we students of interpretative speech make to freeing America of fears, to relieving the confusion of our era, to building peace instead of war? We can give our students and our audiences literature which reveals the *truth*. Are we as teachers of speech dedicated to the truth which makes men free or have we been guilty of expediency?

Archibald McLeish, a poet dedicated to speaking the truth about our era whatever the personal cost, wrote "The Irresponsibles," an essay concerning the writers of the decade between the two world wars. He says,

History—if honest history continues to be written—will ask of people like ourselves—why did scholars of our generation in our country, witnesses as they were to the destruction of scholarship in great areas in Europe—witnesses also to the rise in their own country of the same destructive forces—why did the scholars—in America fail to oppose these forces while they could—with the arms of scholarship?

Why did we who have been warned of our danger not only by explicit threats but by explicit actions, why did we not fight this danger while the weapon we best used—the weapons of ideas and words—could still be used against it?⁸

⁷Albert Einstein, "Atomic War Or Peace," *Atlantic Monthly* (November, 1947), 32.

⁸Archibald McLeish, "The Irresponsibles," *A Time to Speak* (New York, 1940), 103.

Edna St. Vincent Millay reveals the prescience of a true poet in her "Poem and Prayer For An Invading Army," read by Ronald Colman on D-Day.

Now look you to this matter well: that they
Upon returning shall not find
seated at their own tables—at the head,
perhaps, of the long festive board prinked out in prodigal
array,
the very monster which they sallied forth to conquer and
to quell;
and left behind for dead.

Let us forget such words, and all they mean,
as Hatred, Bitterness and Rancor, Greed,
Intolerance, Bigotry; let us renew
Our faith and pledge to Man, his right to be
Himself, and free.

Did Miss Millay have foresight in suggesting that our G. I.'s might return to find the "very monster that they sallied forth to conquer and to quell and left behind for dead?" We hear it on every hand, do we not, that the conquering nation accepts the very qualities of the enemy she resolved to destroy? Is this happening to America? Is America free? Are we as teachers of speech protecting that freedom?

The play, *The American Way*, made a deep impression upon me. It was a pageant, as you will recall, depicting the life of a family in America and tracing attitudes toward freedom from the Grandfather who was ready to give his life for the idea of liberty to the Grandson who was ready to sell his family and his country, during the depression, because the way was hard. What would a sequel, or a few more acts, to this play depict? — Splendid scenes of heroism during the war. When the challenge came the discouraged youth who could not find a job during the depression became a hero on Okinawa or the beaches of Normandy. What then? How would you conclude the play with a scene dated Spring 1948? Would there be a triumphant conclusion depicting freedom for America and all mankind? Would our play have to peter out with defeatism as the original script concluded? What can you and I do as teachers of interpretative reading, as directors of plays? After reading Mr. McLeish's words concerning "The Irresponsibles" (about eight years ago), I started an article which I thought might be published in one of our speech journals. I called it "*We Irresponsibles*." Yes, as teachers of speech, drama, interpretative reading, I think we have sometimes been irresponsible where Freedom was concerned. I think John Philpot Curran was right that "Eternal Vigilance is the

price of freedom." I agree with the orator of yesterday, today, and forever that the foundations for character, for statesmanship, and for freedom are the home, the church and the school. The school—that's us.

Have we as educators selected plays for their value in character building, for their value in presenting truth, for their value in instilling a love of truth in our students? Do we present dramas which prepare our students and our audiences for true freedom? Have we ever selected plays that present false attitudes toward morality, toward beauty, toward truth? Were we true to our heritage of freedom when we justified the unwholesome, the pathological with such statements as, "It is what the public wants—we have to make money—I have to win contests to keep my job." Have we been irresponsible when we have catered to the taste of the woman's club for the latest best seller? I have frequently heard, "You have to give the public what they want, and they want the spectacular, the superficial." I should like to challenge such attitudes and give experiences to support that challenge.

A number of years ago a woman's club in Gatesville, Texas, asked one of my seniors for a program. They said they wanted her to be sure to give something entertaining, light, and humorous. I answered that I had nothing light and humorous to offer, but I would promise that they would be entertained in a more satisfactory manner if they would let me send one of my best readers with good material. In fact, I said, "I'll promise that you will be more than pleased and will be glad I sent you something worth while." They agreed, and I sent a good reader who gave them Molnar's *The Cradle Song*. The women were delighted. They have asked us for a program every year since then, and they have frequently asked for two or three readers in a season.

Our Shakespeare readings are among the most popular. Last year five students gave Shakespeare programs. Every reader in the class was called upon to read to several clubs in and out of the city of Waco.

When the women's clubs find that we will not give them superficial, unworthy literature they sometimes seek elsewhere but we always have more invitations than we can fill and our popularity has grown with our standards.

The oral study of literature contributes to the student's freedom in the use of language by increasing his vocabulary and contributing to his oral style. Good writers have always attributed their style to the effect of the literature they read in childhood and youth. Many writers of the 19th century gained style from reading Shakespeare and the Bible. If one learns good style by reading silently, how much more influence may good literature have on one who speaks it well? Does not good style contribute to freedom of speech?

Emily Post says there are Southerners who, having been reared

on the King James Version of the Bible, have acquired unconsciously a speech so pure and beautiful that they are acceptable to cultured society anywhere.

Through the oral study of literature we get training in pronunciation and articulation. We should develop free bodies and free voices. We may cultivate the habit of variety of tone, rhythm, tempo, and pitch. We should learn the secrets of pause, emphasis and subordination. All of the techniques of the "art which conceals art" and hence "commands the interest and attention of an audience" may be learned through interpretative forms of speech. These elements are recognized as fundamentals of good speech. They contribute to the freedom of the speaker in communicating ideas—hence to freedom through speech.

In summary we may say the essentials of the speech which makes us free are: truth, the harnessing of emotion to reason, and a style of delivery which adequately expresses our meaning. These essentials of free speech may be gained through interpretative reading and educational theatre.

IN THE LAND OF THE DUMB

ELTON ABERNATHY

Southwest Texas State College

Virtually every great social or educational movement centers around, or is epitomized in, the work of one man. Such a man in the field of liberal education was Charles W. Eliot. When President Eliot took over at Harvard University he found there a most restricted and classical curriculum. Along with every other American school, Harvard was far behind European colleges and universities which had branched out into diverse fields of knowledge. To remedy the situation President Eliot introduced the so-called "Free Election" system. That introduction of an educational philosophy, destined to spread all over the country, was recently called by the Harvard committee a necessary and inevitable move. And yet, like most reversals of policy, there came abuses. A person who was allowed to take anything at all in the curriculum might be an indiscriminate taster, he might be a dilettante. Years of experimentation with the free elective system, devoid as it was of intellectual discipline, brought striking modifications. As various departments began requiring that graduates in their fields have a certain body of materials or number of courses, the "major" system became prevalent.

Yet even the major system was not a perfect solution. It also went too far. The professional schools began to complain about the pre-professional training of their students. They said these people had had too little basic general culture, too little broadening, to ever become anything more than simple technicians. Colleges and universities, they said, were training but not educating.

Prior to the second World War, the University of Florida, the University of Iowa, and various institutions set up what they called a "Core" liberal arts curriculum, comprising in some cases the first two years of the college course. And during the war the Council designated to produce a design for general education for the armed forces approached the pattern of requiring that certain basic arts and sciences be taught to every student, regardless of his special interests. With the conclusion of war the number of institutions experimenting along these lines has multiplied.

Having moved thus far, however, the advocates of unity in the curriculum became subject to exploitation. A few leaders in certain "classical" departments, having fought a rear guard action against progress for years, saw in this new movement a chance to recoup their losses. They have wrapped their academic robes tightly about them. They have excluded things here, there, and yonder unless it fits their classical tradition. Of particular interest to you and me is the fact that they would exclude speech, as not being worthy of their narrowly restricted "Liberal Arts Curriculum."

My thesis today, therefore, is that speech has a basic role in a general or a liberal education. That thesis includes virtually the

entire field of speech, but I am going to deal particularly with persuasive speaking—public speaking, if you please. My first reason for saying that persuasive public speaking has a basic role in liberal education is that historically it was the core of the entire Liberal Arts field. A. T. Weaver tells us that the oldest manuscript in existence was written about 3000 B.C. It was discovered in an Egyptian tomb, and was a speech text book designed for the ignorant. Weaver goes on to say, from the time of Ptah-Hotep on down through the great days of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian to the present moment, speech has always had an irrefutable case for recognition as of central importance in any well conceived program of education.¹

But it is not only because speech is historically and traditionally a part of the Liberal Arts curriculum that it asks to retain its true position. I believe the Liberal Arts student receives basic values from speech training which he receives nowhere else. In the first place, the objectives of speech training integrate, and in many cases coincide with, those of education. I care not which statement you accept, whose list you take. You might like William James' comment that, "Education is for behavior, and habits are the stuff of which education consists."² You might prefer John Dewey's Statement, "The best education consists of active participation and experiences which develop human power and ability,"³ or you might like the list of objectives of liberal education proposed by one of its gods, Stewart G. Cole, who wrote *Liberal Education in a Democracy*. His objectives read as follows: 1. Social Democracy, 2. Personal Character, 3. Aesthetic Sensitivity, 4. The Scientific Method, 5. Personal Religion, and 6. Versatile Language Communication Ability, to serve the first five.⁴ Perhaps even a better classification was made by the Harvard committee when it listed the abilities to be fostered by education: 1. The ability to think effectively; 2. The ability to communicate thought; 3. The ability to make relative judgments; 4. The ability to discriminate among values.⁵ I say you may take any one list you choose of any thinker in the field of liberal education, and you will find that the objectives of the teaching of persuasive speaking either coincide with his conception of education, or they serve toward the realization of his objectives.

Not only that, but Liberal Arts students need what speech offers. For one thing, many students are potential teachers. And every

¹Andrew T. Weaver, "The Case for Speech," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXV (April, 1939), 188.

²Quoted by James M. O'Neill, in "Speech in the Changing Curriculum," *ibid.*, XXII (April, 1936), 183.

³*Ibid.*

⁴Stewart G. Cole, *Liberal Education in a Democracy* (New York, 1940), 67.

⁵*General Education in a Free Society, Report of the Harvard Committee* (Cambridge, 1945), 64-65.

study of potential teachers with which I am acquainted reveals shocking inadequacies in their speech habits. We recently made a study on our own campus which indicated that those inadequacies have not been overcome after from one to forty years of college teaching. We found a very significant and a very high correlation between the observers' statement, "That person is a good, a fair, or a poor teacher," and his rating the person on a scale of values as a good, a fair, or a poor speaker.

But not only do our students of the Liberal Arts curriculum need speech because many of them are going to be teachers; they need speech because all of them are going to be citizens of a democracy. "A proper knowledge and exercise of rhetoric," said Aristotle, "would prevent the triumph of fraud and injustice (for they are by nature the weaker side)."⁶ He said, further, that "if it is a disgrace to a man when he cannot defend himself in a bodily way, it would be odd not to think him disgraced when he cannot defend himself with reason (in a speech)."⁷ This, I think, is particularly significant to us. Aristotle concluded his list of the values of rhetoric by noting that, "it is the . . . art to discern the genuine means and also the spurious means of persuasion,"⁸ the thing we have been talking about and calling propaganda techniques. The Harvard committee said this: "Democracy is the view that not only the few, but all are free, in that every one governs his own life and shares in the responsibility for the management of the community."⁹ The committee went on to say, "A democracy must persuade, and persuasion is through speech. . . . Failure in communication means a breakdown in the democratic process."¹⁰ Earl Fleischman carried that one step further when he said, "Everywhere about us in the world today we see abundant evidence of the failure of human beings to understand each other and get along in the co-operative enterprise of modern society."¹¹

There is an old proverb that "in the land of the blind, the one-eyed man is king." If I might pervert that proverb just a bit, "in the land of the dumb, the demagogue is dictator." We say a great deal about freedom of speech. What is freedom of speech to the man who cannot use it? What is freedom of speech to the man who is dumb? In the land of the dumb, the demagogue is *der Fuehrer*. In the land of the free, the man who promotes the utilization of knowledge through effective speaking is indeed a citizen of the world.

⁶Lane Cooper, trans., *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* (New York, 1932), 5.

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸*Ibid.*

⁹*General Education in a Free Society*, 52.

¹⁰*Ibid.*

¹¹Earl Emery Fleischman, "Speech and Progressive Education," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXVII (December, 1941), 512.

IN THE REALM OF RADIO

J. C. WETHERBY
Duke University

I have been allotted twenty minutes for this discussion, but in the "Realm of Radio" there is no such thing as twenty minutes. I shall talk for fourteen minutes and thirty seconds, allowing time for a short commercial if the announcer so desires.

We are now engaged in a tremendous effort to protect the freedom of the world, but we should remember that in order to radiate that commodity we must have an exportable surplus here at home. Let us examine our resources. If we are to be free does it not presuppose that we must be an enlightened, well informed, educated people? Are we, as educators doing our job? If we think we are educating the American people we are kidding ourselves. The real work of education is being done by those mediums of mass communication, the press, the movies, and the radio; there are the sources of the ideas and information of Mr. and Mrs. America. L'il Abner, Hopalong Cassidy, and Jack Armstrong are the real teachers.

We, as speech teachers, can leave the problem of the press to the teachers of journalism. The motion picture is more in our province, but because of the complexities of the industry we can do little other than talk about it. It is in the field of radio that we have our chance. Let us see what we can do about it.

In one phase we have achieved a moderate success and are improving. That is in the training of the actors, announcers, and producers who put the finished product on the air, the skilled mechanics of the industry. We have, to a great degree, mastered the techniques of the medium. Perhaps in this success lies one of our weaknesses. Perhaps we have been so interested in the machinery that we have lost sight of the purpose of the machine. Perhaps we have been so interested in getting a show "on the air" that we have neglected to formulate fundamental reasons for the broadcasting of it.

Let us take another look at what we have. We have the facilities of a multi-million dollar industry. The vast majority of the radio stations are on the alert for good programs, "in the Public Interest Convenience and necessity," with which to balance their commercial programming. If they can get the material they will devote around twenty per cent of their air time to such civic programs. Figured on the commercial morning rates for the average 5000 watt station, this would amount to around \$1,500 dollars a week per station. They want these programs not only because they build listener interest, but also because the men operating the sta-

tions are members of the community and feel a sense of duty to that community. However, they do have certain obligations. First, they have a duty to their listeners to present the material in an interesting manner and make it worth the audience's time. They also have a duty to the sponsors to maintain their listening audience. Too often the Guppie Watchers Association will request and receive air time. Then, a few minutes before time for the broadcast, the president of the local chapter or board will appear with an article clipped from the *Watcher's Journal* and read it in his best third-grade reading style. This might be of interest to Guppies but it isn't to the station's audience, and there is a loud click as dials are switched all over town. After a few experiences of this nature can we blame the station if they view such request with suspicion and alarm? Despite this, most stations are willing to give all the assistance they can to civic and educational broadcasting. Of course, one does occasionally meet a hardhearted and opinionated station manager, but I have been told that there are even hardhearted and opinionated deans; there are station owners whose only interest is in the money they can make. As teachers we cannot understand anyone's interest in money.

The problem of the educational broadcaster, then, resolves itself into one of getting the right program to the broadcaster at the right time and in the best form. One of the complaints I have frequently heard from the broadcaster is that they do not know what is available for broadcasting. The public service broadcaster, particularly educational institutions, should make a point of keeping a continual inventory of their resource material. Is the glee club working up to concert pitch? Has Professor Fusty hit the market with a new hot book? Can we do something special for St. Swithins Day? Keep the stations informed of what we have and what is going on. However, we cannot depend on the special event to do our duty to our air. Some of us, according to the broadcasters, depend on such sporadic events. We must take advantage of continuous programs to build up an audience. It is proven by the soap operas we deplore, that the five day a week strip show has great audience appeal. What we need, in a word, is more showmanship. We are not selling soap, we are selling America freedom.

The possibilities for radio material are abundant if we remember our fundamental aim which might be the showing of how freedom works at the most important level, ourselves, the individual. How do our local social agencies work? What is going on in our town and school? Who are our heroes, past and present? It seems to me that American history could be every bit as fascinating as *Captain Midnight*. Local problems should be discussed and national and international affairs related to the home town folks. Up in Boston the dialogues of Plato were made to come alive again through radio. According to reports, Plato built up a rather impressive Hooperrating.

WHA in Madison built a very popular program by dramatizing *The Congressional Record*.

The speech trained person has a particular responsibility for the development of good public service programs because he has the "know how." We should know how to present the material effectively and be able to tell the good from the bad, the effective from the dull. We should take the lead in seeing that this great means of selling our wares is used and used effectively. We should do all we can to organize and make Radio Councils work to explain the community to itself. This is one way we can fight for our freedom and make ineffective the work of those who would take it away from us.

Another way we can better this medium that has been given us is in the field of program research and development. The broadcaster cannot afford to spend the money, time, and effort required in the experimental development of new types of shows. He must pay for talent, music, writers, and promotion and audience reactions are difficult for him to gauge. We have a substantial pool of interested and active volunteers for this work. He cannot sell a new program to a sponsor and assume the risks of losing a client. Remember—it is the station owner and the sponsors who make our use of radio possible. We, on the other hand, have all to gain and nothing to lose. This need has been expressed by many broadcasters. Those of you who attended the Institute for Education by Radio in Columbus, Ohio, last year will remember Mr. Ed Kobak, President of Mutual, begging the educators to do more experimental types of radio programs, to be more adventuresome and less pedantic in their efforts, and to be assured that the broadcasters are eager to get good programs of this type. What you can do I cannot say. If I had any good program ideas I would be selfishly silent, but surely if our physicist colleagues can come up with the atomic bomb, we can bring forth a cannon cracker.

Have you ever, when you are in front of a microphone in a radio station, wondered if anyone was on the other end listening? The problem of getting people to listen to programs is a knotty one which the commercial broadcasters have failed to master. This is one field where we have the means to do things that are not available to the radio stations. As our broadcasting is of an altruistic nature, the newspapers are much more likely to publish our program publicity. We have access to school papers, club newsletters and the like. A note sent home with Johnny or Mary has proven a very effective way to get a listening audience. We can do a great deal to foster good critical listening habits. These tools can be used not only to promote our own shows, but also to build audiences for the many worthwhile sponsored and sustaining programs. This, it seems to me, is a vital part of the educational process. Needless to say, such program promotion pleases the radio stations and gives them a warm feeling around their heart toward us.

There is one other duty we have to radio which we share with every other American. As radio is our medium, a great share of the responsibility for keeping radio a free institution is on our shoulders. Is radio free? Compared with the government controlled radio of those nations behind the iron curtain, or even the government operated radio of other countries, our radio is free. I believe we are safe in assuming that American radio is the freest radio in the world today. Let's keep it that way. According to the report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, seven of the great consumer industries give the networks three quarters of their income. Hence, through their advertising agencies, they determine what we hear from those networks. These advertisers, however, are in the business of selling their products and are susceptible to public opinion if it is effectively expressed. The government regulates radio through the F. C. C. and we, the voters, regulate the government. We must keep informed on radio problems and keep our government informed of our opinions. For example, should radio stations editorialize on the air? What do you think? Let your congressman know. Let your radio station know. We must do our share in creating an informed public opinion.

Radio to be free must regulate itself. This necessitates a professional code of ethics. Here is another job for us. If we are training the men and women who will direct the radio of the future, are we developing in them the professional ideals and attitudes that will place the radio profession on the same ethical level as the professions of law and medicine?

I have touched on only a few of the problems which we have. I have not mentioned the very real problem of procuring of writers. I have not mentioned television. These and many more problems, we must be thinking about. The main idea is to do something. If we do not some day a man in a double breasted, blue serge suit will walk into the radio station and say, "From now on you will broadcast only what I tell you to broadcast," and another man in blue will be standing in your classroom telling you what you may and may not teach.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LITURGICAL DRAMA

ANDREW H. ERSKINE
Muhlenberg College

"Wilt thou not then flee from these chairs of the enemies of Christ, this seat of pestilences?"¹ thundered Tertullian about 198 A.D. In this furious utterance he but began the hostility to the drama which was manifested by virtually all the early Church Fathers. Soon this animosity went from words to deeds and various provinces of the Church passed edicts excommunicating actors and spectators alike. Finally in 692, at the Council in Trullo, held at Constantinople, all theatrical activity was prohibited throughout the Christian world.² The cult of Thespis was dead. Or so the clergy thought.

But drama has too much popular appeal to be stifled permanently. Ironically enough, the Church, the greatest enemy of the pagan theater, was the very institution which resurrected the drama. Just about two hundred years after the edict of the Council in Trullo there lived in the monastery of St. Gall two monks, Notker and Tutilo. Finding it difficult to remember the newly-introduced and often elaborate musical embellishments, sung on a single syllable of certain words in the liturgy, these men began writing mnemonic sentences under these melodies. Long verbal interpolations were termed sequences, and short ones tropes. Because of their brevity, tropes were more easily inserted in a service and the writing of them became a popular occupation for monks of literary ability. Throughout the ninth and early tenth centuries trope writing flourished. One of these tropes, presumably composed at St. Gall, perhaps by Tutilo, was placed before the *Introit* or introduction of the Easter Mass. Commonly known by its first two words *Quem Quaeritis*, this amplification of the liturgy is looked upon by most authorities as the Adam of modern drama.

In its simplest form, preserved in an early tenth century St. Gall service book, the *Quem Quaeritis* is a three-line dialogue which may be translated as follows:

Whom seek ye in the sepulchre, dwellers in Christ?
Jesus of Nazareth, the Crucified, O Heaven-dweller.
He is not here, He is risen as was foretold; go,
announce that He is risen from the tomb.³

¹Sheldon Cheyney, *The Theatre* (New York, 1929), 135.

²*Catholic Encyclopedia*, 15 vols. (New York, 1914), XIV, 559.

³Translated by the writer from Karl Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, 2 Vols. (Oxford, 1933), I, 201.

The last word is followed immediately by the Introit of the Mass, and there are no stage directions on the page to show that the monks of St. Gall acted out this dialogue, making a miniature play of it.

However, within fifty years these three sentences, with certain additions, had become the first drama of the Christian world; for in the *Regularis Concordia*, a book prepared between 965 and 975 to be used by English Benedictines, the *Quem Quaeritis* is a small, but complete drama. Let us examine it for a moment as paraphrased from E. K. Chambers' *The Medieval Stage*.⁴ First we note that the trope has been moved from its position in the Mass to one in the earlier service of Matins. The actors, all monks of course, are four in number. The first, representing a white-robed angel and bearing a palm in his hand, enters the sanctuary without attracting attention and seats himself near the sepulchre, the appearance of which is undescribed. The other three monks, garbed in cloak-like vestments known as copes, represent the three Maries who came to anoint our Lord on Easter morning. Bearing incense which represents the embalming spices, they approach the sepulchre "stepping delicately as those who seek something." The angel challenges them with the question, "Whom seek ye?" and they reply in unison, "Jesus of Nazareth." The angel gives them the glad tidings in substantially the same words as those of the St. Gall text. However, several interesting additions follow, for the trope has been lengthened for dramatic purposes. The Maries turn to the choir and pass on the news of the Resurrection. Then with the words, "Come and see the place," they are recalled by the angel who raises the veil from the sepulchre and shows them that it is empty except for the clothes which had been wrapped around the cross deposited there on Good Friday. The Maries in turn exhibit the grave clothes to the congregation, the *Te Deum* is begun, and the bells chime out for the first time since the beginning of Lent.

In this addition to the liturgical service, dialogue (chanted, not spoken) is joined with mimetic action, costumes of sorts, scenery, and properties. The result is a play and we well say that modern drama is born. But, of course, our ancestors did not stop there. Further additions were made to the *Quem Quaeritis* with or without Scriptural basis. One of the earlier elaborations was the enlarging and beautifying of the sepulchre which in the beginning probably was no more than a pile of service books on either the high altar or one of the lesser ones. There still exists in certain European churches Easter sepulchres, some being carved in the wall, some free standing.⁵ The latter type is generally large enough to admit several persons, permitting greater realism and more vivid action.

⁴E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, 2 Vols. (Oxford, 1903), II, 14.

⁵See illustrations in Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Stage*.

At various later dates there were additions to the text and the action of this rudimentary drama. The first of these was the appearance of Saints Peter and John among the *dramatis personae*.⁶ In the earliest versions the saints are mute, but later texts assign them lines and sometimes the business of racing to the sepulchre. Often versions containing these additional characters show that type casting was resorted to even in those early times, it being stipulated that St. Peter was to be elderly and portly, while St. John was to be young and handsome. Frequently it is noted that St. Peter is to be garbed in red and carry his symbol, the keys to Heaven.

Another and later addition to the *Quem Quaeritis* is the episode of Jesus appearing to Mary Magdalene who first mistakes Him for a gardener.⁷ As far as we can tell, this scene was played reverently and with no more words or action than the Bible allows. Sometimes, particularly in older texts, when this scene is included, the one of the Apostles is omitted. However, certain German and French manuscripts include both scenes, placing that of the Apostles after the one in which Christ appears. Such an order of events is the reverse of that found in the Gospels, but we may forgive the early playwrights this dramatic license, since the Apostles' scene leads more naturally to the *Te Deum* with which the drama closes.

A still later, and more interesting, episode added to this liturgical play is that of the *Unguentarius*, or Spice Merchant.⁸ It is extant in only four texts, all from Prague, but at least one French manuscript hints at it. The texts in which the incident occurs are comparatively late, dating from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when the secular production of religious plays was common. Therefore, it is not illogical to argue that the inclusion of the *Unguentarius* in a liturgical play is the result of secular influences. In these texts the treatment of the scene is simple and reverent, showing none of the coarse humor with which it abounds in secular productions. In the three thirteenth century texts the *Unguentarius* is a *personna muta*, but in the later version he is given four lines. Since the incident involves the purchase of the embalming spices borne by the Maries to the tomb, it naturally precedes all the dialogue and action hitherto described.

With the addition of this incident we reach the culmination of the development of the Easter play. Nothing else could be added to it without making it too bulky to be conveniently interpolated in a religious service. Furthermore, the material afforded by the Biblical narrative of the events of Easter morning had been exhausted

⁶*Ibid.*, I, 307.

⁷Gustave Cohen, *Le Theatre en France au Moyen Age*, 2 Vols. (Paris, 1928), I, 13.

⁸Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, II, 14.

before this, for the episode of the *Unguentarius* has no Scriptural basis.

So far only the Easter play has been discussed and a briefer treatment of the other liturgical plays remains. This is justifiable, however, since the *Quem Quaeritis* was not only the first liturgical drama but also its development was more elaborate and more interesting.

Beginning with the same words, *quem quaeritis*, and frankly imitating the Easter play, is the meager Christmas play, usually known as the *Pastores*. Making its first appearance about a century after the *Quem Quaeritis*, the *Pastores* was as simple as its Easter analogue, although one line longer, consisting of four lines, only one of which was assigned to the shepherds who give the play its name. It is less dramatic in its original form in that we do not know the persons with whom the shepherds are supposed to be conversing.⁹ In a thirteenth century manuscript, the greater part of the dialogue is assigned to the *Obstetrices* or midwives, two in number. The same manuscript indicates the presence of two shepherds. The stage directions are meager and the dialogue in this version is virtually identical with that of the earliest text which is two centuries older.

Indeed, no major elaborations are made in it until a still later manuscript which contains, as a sort of preface to the original dialogue, a dramatization of the angelic salutation, choir boys being "stationed aloft" to represent the Heavenly Host.¹⁰ After the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the shepherds (seven in this version from Rouen) proceed to the crib near or behind the high altar where the virtually unelaborated trope is chanted in dialogue form by the *Obstetrices* and the *Pastores*. This late thirteenth century manuscript shows the Nativity play at the highest point of its development. Christmas Day, for all its joy and sweetness, seems to have provided but little inspiration to the ecclesiastical playwrights.

However, another day of the Christmas season proved more fertile for drama. This was the Feast of Epiphany, or the Visitation of the Magi, properly celebrated on January 6. From the service of that day came the liturgical play commonly called the *Stella*.¹¹

Unlike the *Quem Quaeritis* and the *Pastores*, which were originated in Introit tropes, the *Stella* was evolved from the section of the Mass known as the Offertory. In those ancient days it was the custom of the communicants to bring to the altar gifts of bread and wine during the singing of a psalm known as the Offertory. Since the salient feature of the Magi story is the Wisemen's bringing of gifts to the Holy Child, what could be more appropriate than a reenactment of their doing so at this point in the service?

⁹Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Stage*, II, 5.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 13.

¹¹Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, II, 49.

From an early Limoges manuscript of uncertain date, we learn of the *Stella* in its simplest form, which is very simple indeed. Three clerics dressed as kings enter the choir singing an appropriate chant in which each announces his gift. The first king spies a star hanging from the roof and points it out with appropriate words to his fellows. The star, which is movable, guides them to the high altar where they make their gifts. After this a choir boy representing an angel announces the divinity and majesty of Christ and then the kings depart.

As the *Stella* became more elaborate it was moved out of the Mass where it could be only a distraction. A manuscript from Rouen provides a fine fourteenth century development of the *Stella*. The most interesting addition is an episode in which the Magi fall asleep after making their offerings and a choir boy angel warns them, presumably as they dream, to return home by devious routes lest they be questioned by the jealous Herod. Incidentally this text provides an amusing incongruity in that the Magi are greeted at the "crib" by midwives whose presence there twelve days after the birth is quite unaccounted for.¹²

Herod, referred to in this play, does not make his first appearance in the development of the *Stella* until a later, undated text from Nevers brings him on the scene.¹³ In this version Herod is comparatively tame and a far cry from the raging character he becomes in the secular play. Had he remained as depicted here, Shakespeare could never have coined the phrase "out-Herod Herod." Aside from his brief appearance, this play resembles that of Rouen. However, now that Herod had made his initial appearance, his part rapidly grows in size and importance and later plays such as that of Compiègne make capital of him.

Yet another development of later date is the combination of the *Pastores* and the *Stella* to form an expanded version of the latter, which is further extended in a little later period by the insertion of the Slaughter of the Innocents.¹⁴ The last event was done with much sound and fury on the part of Herod, but with little attempt at a realistic massacre, the scene concentrating on Herod's giving the order and not on its being carried out. The combination of these three events into one play is the climax of the development of the Christmas drama.

There is another liturgical development in the Christmas season which is frequently classed as a play, although on the surface it seems hardly of dramatic character. This is the *Prophetæ*.¹⁵ Its origin was not in the liturgy, but in a sermon often preached at Christmas. The sermon, in the past wrongly attributed to St. Au-

¹²Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Stage*, II, 47.

¹³*Ibid.*, 50.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 102.

¹⁵Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, II, 52.

gustine of Hippo, was to show how various prophets had foretold the birth of Jesus. The preacher even calls upon the pagan poet Virgil to testify, —an interesting addition. The various prophets are represented by appropriately-garbed clerics and each one speaks his piece. But the whole thing seems singularly lacking in action. The presentation, often dubiously referred to as a play, is to be found in late manuscripts from Salerno and Limoges.

Also found in old monastic books are plays dealing with the conversion of St. Paul, the raising of Lazarus, and various events in the life of the Blessed Virgin. While these are religious plays, they are not directly associated with any identifiable part of the Church's services and, that being the case, they cannot be properly classed as liturgical drama.

Also omitted from consideration here are various ceremonies of the Church which, because of their dramatic character, are classed by some writers as liturgical dramas. Such services include the Mass itself, the *Tollite Portas* ceremony of Palm Sunday, and the ceremony of entombing the Cross and Host on Good Friday. While these and other liturgical rites contain dramatic elements, they all lack one of the fundamentals of a play, namely impersonation.

Undoubtedly these rites, though not plays, catered to the need for beauty and pageantry, but their part in the direct development of the drama is small. The theater owes its rebirth rather to the *Quem Quaeritis*, the *Pastores*, and the *Stella*. These writings contain all the elements of drama: impersonation, dialogue, movement, setting, costumes, and properties. Without these liturgical plays the growth of European drama would have been seriously retarded, perhaps to such an extent that we of the theater would not be members of a professional organization. Instead we might be homeless outcasts, denied a place in decent society, and earning meager bread by juggling and cracking jokes on street corners.

SOME DIRECTION PROBLEMS OF THE ARENA STYLE THEATRE

SYDNEY W. HEAD
University of Miami

In the past few years the arena style of production, pioneered by Glenn Hughes at the University of Washington, has been widely adopted with striking success in many parts of the country. The novelty and economy of the device, together with the opportunities it offers for long runs, make it an attractive supplement, or even an alternative, to the conventional stage. The arena stage consists of an acting area surrounded by an audience area. The shape of the acting space and its surrounding tiers of seats can be square, pentagonal, octagonal, round, oval—virtually any shape which local facilities dictate. The Washington Penthouse Theatre, which is a complete theatre plant built especially for arena productions on the basis of long experience, uses a slightly oval acting area. At the University of Miami, Professor Fred Koch has used an octagonal tower to house the "Ring Theatre," as he calls it, so that here the playing space and tiers of seats are octagonal. The Ring seats 112 persons in three tiers of seats on risers of about six inches each. The diameter of the acting area is about twenty feet. Four entrance ways are located at the four points of the compass, but only two of these are used for action, the others being provided to comply with fire regulations. Only one of the entrance ways is an actual exit to the outside of the theatre.

The arena theatre makes no provision for scenery beyond what can be suggested by furniture and other properties. Lighting is accomplished by spots located above and at the periphery of the acting area. They are focused across the area as high as is possible without bringing the beam up to the level of the spectator's eyes. Opening and closing entrances and exits for scenes are accomplished by means of a blackout. Performers are carefully rehearsed to enter or leave the stage quickly and silently in complete darkness.

"Isn't it very difficult for the actors to get used to having the audience so close?" "Isn't the audience made uneasy by the absence of any separation between themselves and the actors?" These questions, or ones like them, almost invariably occur to people when they first hear about the arena style theatre. The answer is "No." True, most of our previous theatre experience has emphasized a sharp separation of the seating area from the acting area. Yet the conventions of the picture-frame stage and the fourth wall seem quickly forgotten by audiences in an arena theatre; at the same time, audiences seem quickly and docilely to accept the new set of conventions of the arena theatre.

There is no question that the arena theatre sacrifices much of the illusion, the glamor, the variety, and the dramatic resources of the picture-frame stage. But the kernel of dramatic interest seems to survive the transplanting, which means, of course, that fundamentally the director's problems are the same on either kind of stage. At the same time, the arena theatre does offer the director the advantages of economy, intimacy, and above all, novelty. Moreover, the arena theatre has a special value for amateurs in that its demands upon actors, generally-speaking, are less exacting.

The director's first problem, when he approaches the adaptation of a play for the arena stage, is to adjust his thinking to the multi-dimensional character of an acting area surrounded by audience. The blocking of a play on a picture-frame stage involves primarily the single lateral dimension, defined in terms of sightlines. In blocking for the arena stage, the director must think of sightlines as being fluid rather than fixed. This thought is likely at first to leave the director with a feeling of helplessness and frustration. He is completely surrounded by sightlines! The only perfect staging possible would be the presentation of a perfect sphere, evenly lighted, and located exactly in the center of the stage!

After the initial wrench of parting with familiar concepts, however, the director is likely to experience a sense of pleasurable release from the old slavery to fixed sightlines. He can maneuver his cast in depth, so to speak. And in practice it soon becomes evident that actually the arena does offer certain permanent points of orientation. These are the entrance ways into the acting area.

First, a digression on the subjects of entrances and exits. It is one of the disadvantages of the arena stage that really effective use of entrances and exits is impossible. In an arena the resources for control and focus of attention simply do not exist in the same degree that do on a picture-frame stage.

This is unfortunate, because the entrance and exits of important characters in modern plays are generally points of strong emphasis. But the entrance ways on arena stages must of necessity run *through* the audiences, so that there can be no strong impact, equally effective for all the audience. The only completely satisfactory exit or entrance I can imagine for an arena stage would be one using a trap door in the center of the floor. A character who shot up, or dropped out of sight, through the trap would be in a situation to get perfect and complete focus of attention of all members of the audience!

In practice, however, entrances and exits must be made through the audience. And since, as I have said, they are most likely to occur in carefully prepared, climactic sequences, the arena director may be obliged to do some rather ingenious rewriting to approximate the desired effect. To cite an obvious and common example, many modern plays point up exits and entrances by the planned use of stairways. I would suggest, then, that one of the first things the

director should do in preparing a play for the arena is to examine the important entrances and exits and make such adjustments as may be necessary; at the same time, he must bear in mind that all curtains require a blackout. Careful planning and much detailed rehearsal are essential for effecting these blackout entrances and exits.

Getting back now to my main thread, I remarked that the entrance ways serve usefully as points of orientation for the director. The entrance ways represent, obviously, exceptions to the proposition that the arena stage is completely surrounded by the audience. In actual practice, then, there are breaks in the encirclement. These breaks provide the only points on the periphery of the acting area where an actor can stand *without* having some members of the audience squarely behind him. Suppose, for instance, the director wishes a character to stand with his back to the audience, his face averted. Or, to take an opposite example, suppose it is important for all the audience to *see* the character's facial reaction at a given moment. The *only* way in which these effects can be accomplished for *most* of the audience is for the actor to stand in an entrance way.

This raises a curious point, does it not? Going on the theory that audience encirclement of the acting area is desirable, it is really a sort of cheating to take an underhanded advantage of the lacunae in the encirclement. It seems to betray a secret yearning for the good old picture-frame stage. Whether or not the director is conscious of this inconsistency, he is bound to find the entrance ways his most valuable positions of emphasis in the acting area. In fact, he must beware of over-using them. They can be insidious. Unless the director is wary, he will end up with a stereotyped little pattern of movement, oriented on these locations.

This use, and potential overuse, of entrance ways is a direct reflection of the fact that on the arena stage any character must have his back to some of the audience *all* of the time. This circumstance appears to be less irksome to the audience than might be supposed. The audience seems quite content to see *some* of the actors' faces *all* of the time, and *each* of the actors' faces *some* of the time.

This brings us to what seems to me the most debatable problem of arena staging. How long should that "some of the time" be? I mean by that, what is the degree of audience tolerance toward the frustration of not being able to see a character's face? I have the impression that the natural tendency of directors is to underestimate the audience in this respect. They reason that, if it is undesirable to leave a scene physically static on the picture-frame stage for any length of time, the permissible length of time on the arena stage must be even less. The question is, how much less? Of course, there is no way of getting a statistical answer to such problems. But we do know that too much movement on the stage can be quite as boring as too little. In the first place, it is quite

impossible to invent convincing motivation for almost constant movement on the part of all the characters in a play. Movement without motivation—or with superficial, obviously contrived motivation—produces a stilted, meaningless unrest. Moreover, the possibilities for variety in movement are limited, being pretty well defined by the position of furniture and its relation to entrance ways. Constant movement is bound in time to set up stereotyped patterns which the audience can recognize and unconsciously predict.

In short, my own advice in the matter of blocking movement for the arena stage is not to worry too much about audience encirclement; use a little more, but not much more, movement than would be normal on the picture-frame stage.

The sight-lines of the picture frame stage require in general a sequence of triangular configurations of the characters, with the upstage corner of the triangle as its apex and most emphatic point. The triangle is also typical of configurations of characters on the arena stage, but with a difference: In the arena, each side of the triangle is equally presented to the audience, and emphasis can be shifted readily to any one of the angles. The circumstance permits what I have called maneuvering "in depth."

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AS A PREACHER

CARROLL ELLIS
Louisiana State University

A familiar figure of speech is "as dry as dust or as dry as a sermon."¹ Perhaps some preachers come under a definition given of people who are engaged in research—"a dog who is carrying a dry, juiceless bone from one hiding place to another hiding place." In the United States in 1947 over twenty million sermons were preached,² and we must admit that this is a great deal of dust and a considerable pile of bones.

But I, for one, think both comparisons are a bit unfair. Religious leaders as a whole speak more often and more effectively than the members of any other vocation. The influence of the pulpit cannot be ignored in a study of American life, either past or present. This is of interest to the social historian, but of equal concern to the rhetorical critic. At least those preachers who through their skill in speaking have achieved a place of influence are worthy of study. Jonathan Edwards, Theodore S. Parker, Henry Ward Beecher, and Phillips Brooks have not been slighted in *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*.³ I should like to present for your consideration another who, I believe, should not be ignored by those interested in the rhetorical methods of great speakers. I refer to Alexander Campbell.

It is not necessary for me to introduce Alexander Campbell in Nashville. He often visited this city and preached here on many occasions. Eighty congregations of Churches of Christ in Davidson County; David Lipscomb College; and *The Gospel Advocate*, a weekly periodical, which has a circulation of over twenty thousand, attest to his influence as a preacher here.

Alexander Campbell was born in Ireland, September 12, 1787. He moved with his family to America in 1809, and settled in what is now West Virginia. He died March 4, 1866, at the age of seventy-nine years.

¹This paper was read at the sectional program in Rhetoric and Public Address at the eighteenth annual convention of The Southern Speech Association, Nashville, Tenn., April 9, 1948.

²Roy A. Burkhardt, "Action From the Pulpit," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 250 (March, 1947), 76.

³William Norwood Brigance, ed., *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, 2 vols. (New York, 1943), I, 213-328.

⁴William Warren Sweet, "Campbell's Position in Church History," *The Christian-Evangelist*, LXXVI, 970, September 8, 1938.

Campbell preached his first sermon in 1810, and his fame as a preacher and religious leader spread rapidly. He helped to launch the Restoration Movement, and was its acknowledged leader during his lifetime. This movement has resulted in the formation of the largest indigenous American church.⁴ There were many aspects to this crusade, but essentially it was a plea for a more practical religion founded more on reason than emotion, and for unity of all Christians on the basis of the Bible. By 1830, those who had accepted the views of the Restorers were expelled or forced to withdraw from the various denominations with which they had been affiliated. Thus they were compelled to form a separate religious communion. The churches were known by the term which the individual congregation preferred. The three names most often used, however, were Church of Christ, Christian Church, and Disciples of Christ. There was one general name given, nevertheless, by their critics, namely "Campbellites." Campbell deeply resented this designation, as did others in the Restoration Movement. He said, "This is both unmanly and unchristian. Men, fond of nicknaming, are generally weak in reason, argument, and proof."⁵

Campbell was active in many lines, but it was through the spoken word that he achieved his greatest influence. He was an outstanding participant in religious debates. In 1820, he held his first religious discussion with the Rev. John Walker in Mount Pleasant, Ohio. He next debated the Rev. W. L. McCalla in Washington, Kentucky, in 1823. In 1829 his opponent was Robert Owen in Cincinnati. His fourth discussion was again in Cincinnati with Bishop John B. Purcell of the Catholic Church in 1836. His last theological contest was in 1843 with the Rev. N. L. Rice in Lexington, Kentucky. Henry Clay presided at this controversy, and a historical marker now stands in front of the Union Terminal in Lexington designating the site of the discussion. All of these debates were with outstanding men, were well attended, and did much to establish Campbell as a speaker.

He spoke in almost every part of the United States. A contemporary said, "People would come from far and near to hear him, some of them making a day's journey. Others would follow him from place to place."⁶ His chief difficulty was generally to procure a building that would accommodate his crowds. Many of his audiences numbered from six to ten thousand. In 1847 he made a trip to England, Ireland, and Scotland, and spoke to crowded houses in all the larger cities. He preached before several state legislatures, and in 1850 spoke before a joint session of Congress. He was also in constant demand as a lecturer to colleges, literary societies, and associations of various kinds.

⁴Alexander Campbell, *Millennial Harbinger* (Bethany, 1830-1863), I, 118.

⁶Archibald McLean, *Alexander Campbell As A Preacher* (St. Louis, 1908), 12.

It is usually difficult to arrive at the philosophy of public speaking which a given great speaker of the past has held. Campbell was generous to posterity in that, though there is no evidence he had formal training in public speaking, he formulated some rather definite principles. While he was a student in the University of Glasgow he wrote in one of his notebooks "qualifications necessary to attain excellence in the composing of sermons." In 1836 he wrote to J. R. Howard, the editor of the *Christian Reformer*, and gave some rules for writing in a religious paper. These two constitute a good index to his theory of public speaking. I should like to give them to you, and then to examine the evidence to see how well he measured up to his standard.

These are Campbell's rules for a preacher and preaching:

1. The preacher must be a man of piety, and one who has the instruction and salvation of mankind sincerely at heart.
2. A man of modest and simple manners, and in his public performances and general behavior must conduct himself so as to make people sensible that he has their temporal and eternal welfare more at heart than anything else.
3. He must be well instructed in morality and religion, and in the original tongues in which the Scriptures are written, for without them he can hardly be qualified to explain Scriptures or to teach religion and morality.
4. He must be such a proficient in his own language as to be able to express every doctrine and precept with the utmost simplicity, and without anything in his diction either finical on the one hand or vulgar on the other.
5. A sermon should be composed with regularity and unity of design, so that all its parts may have a mutual and natural connection, and it should not consist of many heads, neither should it be very long.
6. A sermon ought to be pronounced with gravity, modesty and meekness, and so as to be distinctly heard by all the audience.
7. Let the preacher, therefore, accustom himself to articulate slowly and deliver the words with a distinct voice, and without artificial attitudes or motions or any other affectation.⁷

⁷Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, 2 vols. (Cincinnati, 1897), I, 138.

Now, let us see Campbell's rules for writing. The following are the tenets which he sent to J. R. Howard:

1. Introduce nothing into your pages that is not of obvious practical utility.
2. Remember, many readers have minds. Therefore give a reasonable variety.
3. Avoid the appearance of dogmatism. Be independent, but not disdainful of the views and opinions of others.
4. Be not too fond of analogies, new ideas, fine sayings and smart repartees.
5. Be assured that moral influence depends upon moral goodness; and therefore our reputation for moral goodness is essential to moral usefulness. We must show a good spirit as well as good arguments.⁸

This was Campbell's theory. Let us see now, if he preached as he said public speaking should be practiced. This will not be too difficult, for there is abundant comment on the part of those who heard Campbell speak. The five debates of Campbell were published, and also a book containing his most important lectures. I know of only three sermons which are now in existence, but the other material makes up for this deficiency. Therefore, from the evidence at hand it is possible to make an evaluation of Campbell's speech practices. In order to avoid repetition his theory may be reduced to five principles.

I

One precept was, "Be assured that moral influence depends upon moral goodness." Of the thirteen rules which Campbell gave, at least four concern ethical proof. He felt that above all the preacher must live a moral life, and have the salvation of mankind sincerely at heart.

There were many things which gave Campbell a strong ethical appeal. His appearance was in his favor. He has been described by contemporaries as being close to six feet in height, with a physical frame well proportioned, and as possessing the dignity of Webster.⁹ Timothy Flint, who Vernon L. Parrington says was the first literary man of the West,¹⁰ attended the Owen debate in Cincinnati and wrote not only a description of the events but of Campbell as well.

⁸J. R. Howard, *The Christian Reformer* (Paris, Tennessee, 1836), I, April, 1836.

⁹W. T. Moore to F. M. Rains, in 1917. Original in possession of The Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Canton, Missouri.

¹⁰Vernon Louis Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought*, 3 vols. (New York, 1930), II, 163.

"The champion of the covenant is a citizen of Bethany near Wheeling, a rather small head, of a sparkling, bright and cheerful countenance, and finely arched forehead; in the earnest vigor of youth, and with the very first sprinkling of white on his crown. He wore an aspect, as of one who had words both ready and inexhaustible, and possessed the excellent grace of perseverance, to a degree, that he would not retreat an inch in the way of concession to escape the crack and puddling of the dissolving world."¹¹

Even though he was bitterly denounced by many for his religious views, most of his opponents did not impugn his sincerity or honesty. His readiness to discuss religious differences, and the unimpassioned manner in which he debated caused the majority to be impressed by his integrity. Bishop Purcell after his debate wrote, "Campbell was decidedly the fairest man in debate I ever saw, and as fair as you can possibly conceive. He never fought for victory, like Dr. Johnson. He seemed to be always fighting for the truth, or what he believed to be the truth."¹²

George D. Prentice, the editor of the *Louisville Journal*, was obviously an admirer of Campbell. In an editorial concerning him he wrote, "His self-reliance, self-fidelity . . . are of the stamp which belongs only to the world's first leaders in thought or action. His personal excellence is certainly without a stain or shadow. His intellect, it is scarcely too much to say, is among the clearest, richest, profoundest ever vouchsafed to man."¹³

Campbell rarely used techniques in a particular speech to increase his ethical proof. If he complimented the audience, he was very brief. He almost never used personal illustrations. His appearance, reputation, attitude, and ability, however, made individual techniques unnecessary.

II

Closely associated with ethical proof was another of Campbell's precepts. He believed that "a preacher must be well instructed in morality and religion." He thought that a preacher must have a broad background of knowledge. On one occasion he wrote with reference to sermons, "I am more concerned with matter than manner."¹⁴

Campbell attended elementary school in Ireland, but after graduation received his instruction from his father. Under his guidance

¹¹Timothy Flint, *The Western Monthly Review* (Cincinnati, 1826-1839), II, 640.

¹²Quoted in Benjamin Lyon Smith, *Alexander Campbell* (St. Louis, 1930), 152.

¹³McLean, *Alexander Campbell As A Preacher*, 44.

¹⁴D. S. Burnet, *The Christian Preacher* (Cincinnati, 1836-1837), January, 1836.

he studied English grammar, French, Latin, and Greek. He also spent much time in reading and memorizing selections from the British poets. Therefore, one is not surprised to find numerous quotations and literary allusions in his speeches. He began early in life to commit a passage of Scripture to memory each day. He was a diligent student of the Bible, and his profound knowledge of the Bible is evident in all of his speaking.

Campbell attended Glasgow University for only one year. He was proficient enough in Latin and Greek that he often took his class notes in Latin, and made extra money by serving as a tutor in Greek. Early in life he formulated definite study habits which he continued throughout his life. He would often study fourteen hours a day. His speeches show great knowledge of the Bible, history, literature, and foreign languages. This background of knowledge gave him assurance, and brought solid substance to his discourses.

III

Campbell's third precept concerned language. He believed "a preacher should be proficient in his own language." He felt that simplicity and dignity should characterize the language of the pulpit.

His interest in his own language is shown by the fact that he was the first translator of the New Testament into modern speech. Further proof of not only interest but study is his lecture, "The Anglo-Saxon Language: Its Origin, Character and Destiny." To see his appreciation of the English language and a brief example of his use of it, consider this passage from this address, "Its capacity is immense. For strength of frame it has the bone and muscle of the Romans, the Goths and the Saxons. It has the patience and endurance of the German and the Dutch, both High and Low. It partakes of the vivacity of the French, of the genius of the Italian, the wit and sprightliness of the Greek and Celt. For comprehension, if for nothing else, our language is chief amongst all the dialects of the earth."¹⁵

Campbell's speaking vocabulary was immense. The influence of his writing must not be overlooked in this regard. He was a voluminous writer. All in all, there are sixty volumes to his credit, and he always carried on a heavy correspondence. In his speeches he often used colorful and "loaded" words, but his style could not be described as florid. Dignity and loftiness, however, seem to characterize his language rather than simplicity. At times his style appears rather pompous.

IV

The fourth rule related to organization. "A sermon should be composed with regularity and unity of design." Campbell said, "To

¹⁵Alexander Campbell, *Popular Lectures and Addresses* (Cincinnati, 1863), 16.

a person well disciplined and practiced in classification, all nature, society, literature, science, art, ever stand in rank and file before him, according to his intimacies with them. In the philosophy and skill of the greatest military chieftain that ever lived, he can assemble the greatest force to a given point in the shortest time. He, too, superlatively enjoys his own knowledge, just as the prudent mistress of a household, who has a place for every thing and every thing in its place, enjoys all her resources. He also sees order, harmony, variety, fitness, beauty, from a thousand points inaccessible to one destitute of this sovereign art."¹⁶

Campbell applied this principle in his speaking. There is no evidence that he prepared a written outline, but his speeches have a definite organization. The plan of most of them follow the same pattern. He would usually have a brief personal introduction. The one used in an address to the Union Literary Society of Miami University, Ohio, in 1844, is a typical example.

Members of the Union Literary Society of Miami University: Soon as I had obtained my own consent to appear before you on the present occasion, in pursuance of the very polite and flattering invitation I had received from you, I immediately laid all my powers of invention under tribute to furnish a subject worthy of your attention. But, to my great disappointment, I never knew them pay any tax imposed upon them with so much reluctance. Weeks passed away before I could even fix upon any topic; and after I had resolved upon one, new, unexpected and inexorable calls upon my time and labor, so crowded upon me as to leave but a few fragments to devote to a subject, which, in my humble opinion, deserves a year rather than a few hours, and a volume rather than a single address.¹⁷

After such a personal introduction he would then state the subject, and almost invariably define the terms. His favorite method of definition was by etymology. Then he would state the points which he intended to develop. As a rule, these would not exceed three. At the conclusion of each point he would make a brief summary. This would usually be more emotional than the development of the point. For example, in a speech entitled "Social Improvement" he had two main points: the importance of woman and the Bible in social betterment. After a discussion, largely drawn from history, of the importance of woman in social advancement, he closed by saying, "No, thank Heaven's eternal King, there is no limit set to her power. It may be temporal, spiritual, eternal. If woman has

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 127.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 73.

vanquished Samson the strongest of men, Solomon the wisest of men, and Adam the greatest of men, she has been made the mother of the Saviour of men, and may through the religion of her Son and of her Lord, exert a transient power over the destiny of man. She may bless a family, a nation, a generation, a world—not only for a jubilee, an age, a few centuries, but forever and forever.”¹⁸

His transitions are always clear. After a discussion of the points he employed a summary conclusion. They are never very long, and if there is an appeal for action it is brief and without much emotion. Campbell said that a sermon should not be very long. I will let you judge as to how well he adhered to this rule. His sermons lasted two hours, but that was according to the custom of his day.

V

His fifth principle was “Let the preacher accustom himself to deliver the word with distinct voice, and without artificial attitudes or motions of any other affectation.” He believed that delivery should not call attention to itself.

Campbell always spoke extemporaneously because he felt it was the superior mode of delivery. His reason was, “Our words react upon ourselves according to their import; and hence we are sometimes wrought up to a pathos, a fervor, an ecstasy, indeed, by the mysterious sound of our own voice upon ourselves, as well as that of others, to which we never could have ascended without it. Hence the superior eloquence of extemporaneous speaking over that of those who read or recite what they have coolly or deliberately thought at some other time and in some other place.”¹⁹ I know of only three sermons which Campbell ever wrote out completely, and these were for publication rather than delivery. One of these was published in the paper, *The Christian Preacher*, edited by D. S. Burnet. The letter which he sent with the sermon is revealing.

Dear Bro. Burnet:

My sermon is just this moment launched; it has been three weeks on the stocks; in that time I have been on a tour of ten days to Ohio, and perhaps, have spent between two and three days in getting it ready for the sea. It is pitched within and without; but there was no time for painting. The seams are, I hope watertight, though I used the hand ax more than the joining plane. In truth, I am a poor hand at writing sermons. This is the third discourse I have written in twenty-five years.²⁰

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 66.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 19.

²⁰Burnet, *The Christian Preacher*, January, 1836.

Contemporary testimony reveals that Campbell had a clear voice and could be heard by a large audience without difficulty.²¹ Apparently his Scotch brogue did not interfere with communication. He stood erect and used few gestures. One hearer said, "His carriage was erect and imposing, but his pose was not that of an orator who has carefully studied pantomime and stands for effect. He seemed oblivious of his attitude; he had something to say, but no piece to act."²² During his later years he would lean on his cane and rarely move from one spot. Jeremiah Black, the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, described his preaching: "The interest which he excited in a large congregation can hardly be explained. The first sentence of his discourse 'drew audiences still as death,' and every word was heard with rapt attention to the close."²³ Isaac Erret, who was a preacher in the Church of Christ, said, "We have known him stand for two hours, and talk in true conversational style, with scarce a gesture in the entire discourse."²⁴ Many comments could be given but they add up to the same thing; extemporaneous mode of delivery, absence of gesture, distinct voice, and conversational delivery. In fact, those who came to hear Campbell expecting oratorical display went away disappointed in that regard.

In the theory and practice of preaching Alexander Campbell was much concerned with ethical proof, content, language, organization, and delivery. These are usually chapter headings in present-day public speaking texts. It is interesting to note that he used public speaking not for display, but as a practical means of accomplishing certain aims. Early in life he formulated certain speech principles and followed them with remarkable accuracy in his preaching. Public speaking teachers, at least, will say that this is the reason why his preaching was not "dust" and "bones," but a lively and vital performance that exerted a tremendous influence in his day.

²¹W. C. Rogers, *Recollections of Men of Faith* (St. Louis, 1889), 13.

²²Thomas Chalmers, *Alexander Campbell's Tour in Scotland* (Louisville, 1892), 76.

²³Selina Huntington Campbell, *Home Life and Reminiscences of A. Campbell* (St. Louis, 1882), 279.

²⁴McLean, *Alexander Campbell As A Preacher*, 17.

A VIEW OF THE FORENSIC SITUATION

WAYNE C. EUBANK
University of Florida

America's fantastic production of war materials during the recent conflict amazed not only the world but ourselves as well. We mastered the technology necessary for waging war. But technology had its counterpart: that ingredient upon which technological output and application depended—leadership. In all branches of the service the effectiveness of the implements of war depended upon the man who directed the men who employed our weapons. Service and officer training schools were quick to recognize the high correlation between the ability to speak and the capacity to command. The recognition has carried over to peace time. Prior to the war neither West Point nor the Naval Academy actively engaged in competitive forensics. Now both have flourishing programs. This is no accident. The administration of these institutions is solidly behind the program.

But West Point and Annapolis are not singular in their post war experience in forensics. For the first time many colleges and universities are inaugurating forensic programs. With few exceptions schools with many years of experience in these activities are finding interest higher and squads larger than ever before. During the ensuing debate season institutions will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on thousands of students who will participate in a variety of organized speaking activities. There are presently a number of institutions with forensic budgets varying between \$4,000 and \$5,000. Forensics, always important business, has become big business.

The widespread interest and participation in these extra-curricula speech activities is most gratifying to us in the speech field. Moreover, it is most challenging for it is primarily speech teachers in speech departments who will govern the direction and standards of our accelerated forensic program.

Attendant upon this unprecedented growth in forensics are certain procedures that warrant our closest scrutiny for we must make certain that the present growth represents a permanent interest and participation and not the mushroom variety. Some of our current practices are already receiving criticism both within and without the speech field. In order better to secure the future of our forensic program now is the time calmly and sensibly to evaluate current procedures. Now is the time to make corrections if and where they are necessary. Most of you recall that during the thirties when debate was slow in altering its traditional formal nature, there were critics who predicted that discussion would eventually replace debating as the popular and practical form of college forensics. The

controversy actually created rifts and animosities in some quarters. Fortunately, today in most institutions these techniques of the democratic process are studied and practiced with equal respect. Such occurrences as cited above can and should be avoided by wise evaluation of current methods and procedures. To this purpose the following discussion is devoted.

Today the main vehicle for putting our forensic program into practice is the tournament. It should be remembered that the tournament is a relatively recent invention in the field of forensics. Out of necessity it came into being. Pre-depression days were relatively free of tournaments. During the early thirties most debate budgets were visited by famine. Debate directors were no longer able to launch several squads on various sectional loops hitherto traversed. The tournament idea afforded a financial solution. Many schools could meet at a relatively near center and much debating could be done in a very short time. Thus a variety of schools, representing many states and even regions, were able to touch shoulders and enjoy a variety of contacts and friendships hitherto unknown. Certainly the cosmopolitanism present in tournaments has done much to foster and strengthen wholesome associations and respect on a state and sectional level. Furthermore, many debate tournaments offer a variety of individual speaking contests, for instance, oratory, after dinner speaking, extempore speaking, radio speaking, and interpretation. Thus the debater has an excellent opportunity to participate in types of speaking other than debate. This participation in a variety of speaking situations is most desirable.

However, tournament debating seems to be lacking in two important values that were paramount in dual debating, namely post-debate critiques and the presence of an audience. Most tournament directions prohibit critiques, either by rule or because of lack of time. Likewise, most tournaments exclude the presence of a real audience, either by rule or by sheer lack of sufficient numerical number. Finals are frequently held in the presence of audiences. Even then the audience is incidental, at least to the debater. The judge or judges "out front" are all important.

Educators are eternally advocating the necessity of preparing "for life situations." Just how long would the average audience tolerate the bombardment of the average debater in a normal speaker-audience situation?

At best the tournament debater is, in the main, engaging in an artificial situation. Undoubtedly it is artificial insofar as it correlates with the functions of a citizen in a republic. As was noted by Brooks Quimby,¹ such an exercise may be beneficial in the training

¹Brooks Quimby, "Can We Learn from Debating with the British?" *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXXII, (April, 1947), 160.

of lawyers. However, it should be remembered that although juries are judges, they usually behave like audiences and are just laymen chosen by lot. This artificiality, which is now being associated with the tournament idea, may be one reason why discussion is again being heralded by many as far more valuable to the student as an exercise in the use of the tools traditional to democratic procedures.

In eleven tournaments attended by the University of Florida last year, the traditional style of debating was employed with the exception of the one held at the University of Virginia. There were four main speeches ten minutes in length, followed by four rebuttals five minutes in length. Such uniformity is deadening. Furthermore, it is unnecessary. There are other forms of debating besides the traditional that have desirable features, i.e., Oregon style, direct clash, and problem solving. At least an occasional round of discussion would aid in breaking the monotony.

By necessity, and rightfully so, there is tension present at tournaments. Two debates in the morning, three in the afternoon, followed by two, four, or six the next day is sufficient reason for tension and fatigue on the part of the debater and director alike. Even with necessary variety in debate forms the procedure is likely to result in somewhat of a grind. At the end of two days of judging debates the director is likely to be harassed by the question: "Is there real educational value in this kind of procedure or is it a type of intellectual marathon which aims at picking a champion?" If the debate director is not confronted with this query at the end of the first tournament in the fall, wait until he attends four or five tournaments and finds many of the same debaters at all tournaments. It must be recognized that tournaments emphasize winning and there is a strong tendency for the director to take those debaters he thinks will have the best chance of bringing honors to his school. We could mention one team (two men) who participated in some 12 tournaments last year and won the majority of them. That's great guns, especially for the two men. However, a two-man debate squad is carrying specialization to its extreme. If "shingles" and "brass" are the criteria of value in debating, the success of such a program is unquestionable. However, from an educational point of view the "star" system is without defense. It is this psychological and physical tension on the part of the debater and the coach alike that take much of the fun and benefit out of tournament debating. After such a marathon many a director disgustedly states that he thinks he is getting too old for such ordeals, although he may still be in his thirties.

Along with the tournament idea another practice has developed which is somewhat regrettable, namely, the use of a single national question. The merit of such a system is easily recognized. By employing one proposition nationally, preparation for one tournament means preparation for practically all tournaments. Therefore, with

a minimum amount of preparation, more tournaments can be attended by each school. Tournaments begin in November and end in May. Since most tournaments use the national question there follows seven month of debating on the same proposition. Few debate directors would contend that after two or three months appreciable benefits are derived from continued hammering on the same topic. This is particularly true if we consider debating more than an exercise in debate technique; that the acquaintance of the student with current state, national, and international questions and the development of a philosophy concerning them is one of the functional ends of debating.

Since the tournament is destined to be with us for a while, it behoves us to try to accomplish as much as possible with it. Here are a few suggestions.

Certainly the judging problem needs careful attention. Normally, the debate director is the best judge and some tournaments are conducted with directors only as judges. Experience will prove that these tournaments are far more satisfactory than those employing various types of judges such as doctors, lawyers, ministers, and politicians. The West Point National Debate Tournament is an excellent example of a fairly large tournament (34 teams) conducted with debate directors only as judges. A majority of the directors present at the 1948 tournament were interviewed in an attempt to evaluate their opinion of the quality of judging. Without exception every director stated that the judging at West Point was the best of any tournament in which his squad had participated during the year. It would be well for all tournament directors to remember that squads traveling hundreds of miles to attend a decision tournament have a right to expect expert judging. If this type of judging cannot be supplied the tournament should not be held.

The team or squad attitude is another factor that needs close scrutiny. The real squad is not one that feels that every decision it loses is a matter of prejudice on the part of the judge; that if it doesn't win there must be a "frame-up" somewhere. If debate is to develop leadership qualities, debaters must display sportsmanship towards the opposition, respect and appreciation for the opinions and integrity of opponents, and confidence in the ability and opinion of judges. The debate director can go far in developing this spirit of sportsmanship and confidence.

Under the present tournament set-up, there seems to be little hope of developing a normal speaker-audience situation. A few finals will be held in the presence of audiences with the debater's efforts directed primarily to the judges. In the main, the tournament debater, bordered by his colleague, confronted by his opponents, and interested in the little man in the back row of empty seats, must be content with the present artificial vacuum.

In order partially to offset the influence of non-audience tourna-

ment debate training, a system of *extension debating* is suggested. In extension debating the community is your audience and its problems become your propositions. Although this type of program is not practiced generally, some schools have developed the idea with marked success, i.e., the universities of Kansas and Missouri. In this age of emphasis on adult education, the community is becoming increasingly aware of its local problems as well as issues of national and international importance. Experience has shown that there are many groups in close proximity to most universities that would welcome an opportunity to hear a group of trained college speakers explore a proposition. To some hardened tournament debaters a performance before a real audience of interested and appreciative citizens would be a novelty and a revelation. The substitution of warm audience response for the normal tournament vacuum should constitute a most exhilarating experience. Such a program not only performs a service to the community, but also stresses one of the cardinal aims of debate, a keen interest on the part of students in the problem-solution dichotomy that faces the citizen of every American locality.

Widespread employment of the national question in tournaments appears certain. This practice has its advantages and disadvantages as already noted. Much depends upon the resourcefulness of the debate director in seeing that propositions other than the national are debated. In some sections this variety is attained by mechanical methods, for example, state leagues and interstate or sectional conferences have been established. Many of these conferences avoid using the national question thereby giving variety to their debate preparation. A poll taken of the 40 colleges and universities participating in the Southern Speech Association tournament last spring revealed that a majority of the schools were in favor of debating a proposition other than the national. The Missouri Valley and the Western Conference are notable examples of conferences that have selected their own propositions. In such instances sectional and regional problems of vital and timely importance can be framed into propositions.

A basic problem that confronts the tournament system today is the question of tourney sponsorship. It is contended that the conference or a similar organizational system of sponsoring forensic meets is preferable to the usual invitational type of tournament. Literally dozens of privately conducted tournaments have sprung into being during the past two years. Here in the South the trend seems to be for almost every college of any size to think in terms of sponsoring a tournament. At present there are many more invitational tournaments than there are those sponsored by conferences or other similar organizations. Many invitational tournaments are staged by directors who have no connection with the speech field. We do not mean to imply that such tournaments are therefore poorly

conducted. However, it has been our experience that the best run tournaments have been those under the direction of speech departments. For instance, the following excerpt was taken from the rules governing oratory in a large tournament conducted by a person outside the speech field. We quote:

"Modern oration is a secular sermon. It should appeal to your feelings, therefore you will give the award to the speaker who makes you feel most intensely in his favor, who does not alienate you by a trite subject or by an oration disturbing to your beliefs."

Connect this instruction with judges selected at random from various walks of life and the outcome is most unpredictable. It is our conviction that conferences or organizations of similar structure afford the best medium for conducting tournaments. When such organizations are permanent there is much less of the touch-and-go element and more of the lasting type of friendship established. Thus friction is held to a minimum and the relatively small number of participating colleges renders the program more flexible and avoids the unwieldiness of large tournaments.

In order better to achieve some of the basic ends of debating, as well as add more variety to the debate year, a strong *intramural program* is suggested. At the University of Florida we are trying our first post-war intramural tournament. Two leagues have been organized, fraternity and dormitory. It is expected that a total of 200 men will be debating the timely campus question: **RESOLVED: That Student Self-Government Should be Abolished at the University of Florida.** Winners of the two leagues will stage a final debate to determine the intramural champion. All debates will be open to students, and the final debate will be held before the student body. (It is likely that an audience decision will be employed.) In the past, this program has stimulated wide campus interest and has done much toward increasing participation in the debate program.

Another local plan aimed at a more intimate relationship in debating is now in effect at the University of Texas. In addition to other debate activities, once a month during the school term another University squad is invited to spend a day of debating at Texas. During the day a number of standard types of debate are held before speech classes. This is followed by a panel-discussion in the afternoon in the Student Union Building. The day is rounded out with a radio debate in the evening.

An interesting experiment in discussion techniques is now underway at Ohio State University in the form of an "Annual Conference on Public Affairs." The program consists of open hearings, radio discussion, discussion, caucuses, committee meetings, etc. Nationally known authorities on current public affairs are contributors to

the conference. Keen interest in the experiment is evidenced by the fact that 35 colleges and universities participated in the second annual presentation this past spring. The conference is under the direction of the Department of Speech.

The above suggestions for the betterment of our present forensic program are by no means exhaustive. However, it is hoped that they may serve to stimulate further thinking and action by our colleagues.

In summary, as debate directors, let us strive to insure the soundness and permanency of our present forensic growth. Insist that tournament directors vary the traditional style of debate by interspersing other forms in their programs. Insist on adequate judging and request that sufficient time be taken for on-the-spot critiques after each round of debate. Most debaters prefer knowing why they won or lost. Encourage other squads to visit your campus, thus reviving some of the interest in dual debating. These friendly encounters should furnish the much-needed audience situation. Sell your program to the community through a system of extension forensics. This will afford your speakers an opportunity to experience real audience situations. Lend your influence in encouraging the establishment of permanent forensic conferences in your locality. Use propositions other than the national. Finally, stimulate campus interest in forensics through an intramural program employing problems of student interest as propositions for debate and discussion.

In conclusion, as teachers, let us examine more carefully the machinery by which we train the youthful leaders for tomorrow's unprecedented tasks. Are your debaters gentlemen and sportsmen? Do they have knowledge of, interest in, and a philosophy toward a number of current problems? Are they satisfied with superficial attainments, plastering the office walls with certificates, or do they delight in striving for those attributes of leadership attendant upon excellence in debating? Is the community's awareness of your debate program confined to tournament articles in the local paper in which you have played up your victories and minimized your losses? Does the student body at large feel that it has a share in your forensic program? Finally, as a debate director, are you justly proud of the type of men your debate program is molding?

The functional tools of a democratic society are debate and discussion. Freedom in their exercise differentiates a democracy from a dictatorship. Tomorrow is the era of action. Tomorrow, as always, when the time for action arrives, some form of debating will supply the avenue by which America will reach her decisions. As directors of debate we should look carefully to our wares. OTHERS should not find it necessary to remind us that what goes on inside our debate programs should correlate closely with the functions essential to the American way of life.

THE SURVEY AS A METHOD OF RESEARCH

HOWARD W. TOWNSEND
University of Texas

Use of the survey as a method of gathering information is not new in any aspect of modern activity. It is probably more widely used than any other as a basis for analyzing the thinking and habits of the American people on all matters ranging from the type of radio program most popular with the greatest majority through forecasting the outcome of a presidential election to determining the sexual habits of the American male.

The survey method of research is used extensively, too, on the academic level as is attested by the fact that one of the most widely used and authoritative textbooks in colleges and universities. *The Methodology of Educational Research* by Good, Barr, and Scates,¹ devotes one-fourth (201 pages) of its discussion to this method and its variation which is described by the compound adjective "normative-survey." Further proof of its use and value as research is evidenced by the fact that graduate schools in leading universities throughout the nation accept theses and dissertations for advanced degrees based on the survey method of research.

Certain pertinent questions arise. When does survey cease to be merely a means of gathering information and become research? What is normative-survey? What are the forms of survey? What are basic considerations when it is used as a method of research? The first three questions will be answered briefly, but in answering the third the author will attempt to cite his own experience in using the method in preparing a Doctor of Philosophy dissertation which was accepted by the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin in 1947.

"Information getting activities may be regarded as research only when they are relatively formal and carefully planned."² Thus, a poll taken to feel the mental pulse of the man on the street concerning an international situation, or a brief and hasty survey made by a superintendent to determine the background experience of his teachers in extra-curricular activities as part of their high school training, although important to the particular situation, would hardly be considered research in the academic sense. The well-planned, extensive study of the teaching system of an entire state and the formulation of the findings in a formal report such as J. Frank Klier's *Language Teaching in Wisconsin Public High Schools*,

¹C. V. Good, A. S. Barr, and D. E. Scates, *The Methodology of Educational Research* (New York, 1935).

²*Ibid.*, 287.

1941-42, sponsored and published by the State Department of Education, would be so recognized.

"The compound adjective 'normative-survey' is applied to this method in order to suggest the two closely related aspects of this kind of study. The word 'survey' indicates gathering of data regarding current conditions. The word 'normative' is used because surveys are frequently made for the purpose of ascertaining what the normal or typical condition is."³ In this present discussion the single term "survey" will be used in preference to the compound.

"In all, six different types of normative-survey research are recognized . . . namely, (1) survey testing, (2) questionnaire inquiries, (3) documentary frequency studies, (4) interview studies, (5) observational studies, and (6) appraisal procedures."⁴

The type of survey technique which will be herein discussed is the questionnaire inquiry. It is a form prepared and distributed for the purpose of securing answers to listed questions. Although these questions are usually factual: designed to secure information about conditions or practices of which the recipient is believed to have knowledge, they may ask for opinions and attitudes.

The questionnaire method achieves its importance and value in being an instrument for gathering information from widely scattered sources and from people whom it would either be impractical or undesirable to see. In short, it is a method which is (1) easy to put into operation, (2) economical of time, effort, and money, (3) comfortable to use, (4) practical, and (5) comparatively fast moving.

When should the research worker use this method? "The 'normative-survey' method approach is appropriate whenever the objects of any class vary among themselves and one is interested in knowing the extent to which different conditions obtain among these objects."⁵ The type problem for investigation, the objective set for solution, geographical distances, and numbers of subjects for investigation are factors determining whether the research worker should use questionnaire inquiries as his method of research.

The problem for the author's dissertation was to determine the status of speech education in secondary schools and institutions of higher learning in Texas and to make an evaluation of the program. The vast distances in a state as large as Texas, and the great number of secondary schools listed by the State Department of Education, made it not only impracticable but virtually impossible for one individual, either physically or financially, to use the personal interview method, despite some of its definite advantages. After it was decided to focus the study on all of the seventy-eight colleges and

³*Ibid.*, 289.

⁴*Ibid.*, 295.

⁵*Ibid.*, 289.

universities and only the 272 high schools being members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Universities, the questionnaire method remained the only practical one for gathering data.

The problem had determined the method of research; next a workable questionnaire had to be formulated.

The first big step was to consult all available printed matter concerning questionnaire building, to analyze theses, dissertations, and other studies based on the questionnaire method, and to consult with authorities who had used or supervised the use of such a method.

The second big step was to prepare the questionnaire. The following basic principles underlying the formulation of any effective questionnaire were used.

1. A consideration of the time demands on the recipient and his right to ask, "Is there any good reason why I should answer these questions?"

2. Make the questions apply to the particular situation. (The author had to frame two separate sets: one for the secondary level, one for colleges and universities.)

3. Frame questions to make simple, brief responses, such as checking, filling blanks, or giving very brief comments.

4. Avoid all unnecessary specifications, details, and words.

5. Frame questions which will be immediately clear to the recipient as well as to the author.

6. Frame questions and statements easy to interpret because of their clear, specific purpose.

7. Distinguish sharply between questions requesting fact and those requesting opinion.

8. Revise again and again, weeding out every trivial word or statement.

9. Arrange in a form pleasing, easy to distinguish, and allowing plenty of space for response.

The third major step was to have the questionnaire evaluated and to test it. In addition to an evaluation by the major professor, all other members of the Speech Department, authorities on research methods in College of Education at the University of Wisconsin, and certain State Department officials and educators in Texas evaluated the form. Following revision, the questionnaire was tested on students, chiefly teachers, in graduate speech courses.

The fourth major step in this method of research was to determine the most advantageous time for distribution. The weeks immediately preceding or following the beginning of a semester, holiday seasons, mid-term or final examinations did not seem feasible, nor did that period during which the football season was at its height. The time chosen was early March. The returns fairly poured in

for two weeks, then fell off. It had been decided that a seventy-five per cent return was desirable, but sixty per cent would be considered workable. Four written appeals were made before the returns ran high enough. In the final analysis there was a sixty-four per cent return from secondary schools and an eighty-three per cent return from colleges and universities. Let the research worker using this method beware of optimistically expecting an extremely high percentage of return in response to the first request. This can happen, but is the exception rather than the rule. Regardless of the care practiced in preparing the form, many recipients will throw it into the waste basket; others will take the time and effort to write an explanation of how foolish they think the whole project is, or why they are too busy to respond; others will lay it away and forget; still others will lose it. A second or third request may elicit a response from the latter two groups. Even a fourth request will seldom move the first two.

The final step was the tabulation, recording, and interpretation of the data, with its evaluation. This step, since it varies with the problem, purpose, and type of material, calls for much more detailed discussion than can be given here.

The author, basing his observations on his own experience and research, believes the following summary points concerning the survey method (questionnaire inquiry) to hold true.

1. The method is widely used in both formal and informal investigation, but becomes research in the academic sense only when it is formal and carefully planned.
2. Its use must be determined by the type of problem and the objectives set for the solution.
3. It is reliable and accurate only to the degree in which the recipient and interpreter of data are reliable and accurate.
4. The method is economical.
5. It is a convenient method in that the worker need not leave his office to conduct it.
6. Frequently the only practicable method, at times it is the only possible one.
7. It is comparatively fast moving, but requires weeks, months, or years to complete, depending on the rate of response.
8. The method requires careful planning, practical testing, accurate recording, and analytical interpretation.

NEEDED: NEW SIGNALS FOR EFFECTIVE ORAL READING

HAROLD WEISS
Southern Methodist University

That effective oral reading is a matter of grouping words effectively in "phrases" or "word groups" is obvious.¹ Quintilian advised "that our language should be properly punctuated; that is to say, the speaker must begin and end at the proper place."² Modern writers in the interpretative reading field such as Woolbert and Nelson note, "The plain sense of a sentence often hinges upon the relation of phrase to phrase."³ Tresidder adds, "The phrase is the basic unit of interpretation."⁴ Parrish says, "The unit of thought is the phrase or word group."⁵ S. H. Clark⁶ devoted at least five chapters of his book to "grouping." From the ancients to the contemporaries, phrasing is admittedly the prime factor in reading aloud.

Today the radio is our chief vehicle for reading and interpreting from the printed (or typed) page. The announcer, the radio storyteller, and the radio speaker are dependent on these phrases or word-groups that indicate meanings. The manuscript is usually devoid of sufficient characteristic marks to tell a reader exactly where to pause or how long to pause for effective reaction by his audience. Conventional punctuation marks are inadequate signals, as most of the authors in the field agree. The authors of the books on interpretation have indicated this fact repeatedly.

The conventional symbols of comma, period, paragraph, colon, semi-colon, etc., may be adequate for the silent reader without providing practical assistance to the person who wishes to project his ideas orally. The oral reader has the additional problems of eyespan, choice of emphasis, and pauses for breath not shared by the silent reader. Interpreters are all too willing to agree with Clark that "Punctuation in itself does not determine the grouping and pausing,"⁷ or with Tresidder that, "Punctuation is in general sig-

¹This study was aided by a grant from the Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching.

²H. E. Butler, trans., *Quintilian: Institutio Oratoria*, 4 vols. (London, 1922), I, 261.

³Charles H. Woolbert and Severina E. Nelson, *The Art Of Interpretative Speech* (New York, 1927), 127.

⁴Argus Tresidder, *Teaching To Others* (New York, 1940), 30.

⁵Wayland Maxfield Parrish, *Reading Aloud* (New York, 1946), 30.

⁶S. H. Clark, *Interpretation Of The Printed Page* (Chicago, 1915).

⁷*Ibid.*, 38.

nificent in determining phrases, but not all punctuation calls for pauses and not all phrases are marked by punctuation."⁸

Writers in the field of radio speech have also become aware of the inadequacy of our punctuation as stop and go lights in the traffic of our speech. For instance, Abbot says:

Groups of words count more in a radio talk than individual words. The listener picks up phrases and clauses that constitute thoughts. The wise radio speaker does not rely on ordinary punctuation, but goes through his manuscript and marks off groups of words which, put together, bring out his thought.⁹

Hoffman and Rogers indicate:

All good announcers mark their copy to warn themselves when long sentences or long paragraphs may put an additional tax on their breathing apparatus. They pause frequently—not merely at commas—but wherever the thought units indicate a natural pause.¹⁰

Radio speakers have tried to develop their own symbols to indicate the presence of pause and the length of pause between the phrases. Some mark their copy with dots (...), or dashes (---), or slashes (///), each to symbolize a particular time lapse. Thus two dots or slashes between words indicates a shorter pause than four dots or slashes. Some write in short lines—each line standing for a single breath group.

Some research has been done on word groups. Snidecor showed there are more frequent phrase groups in impromptu speaking than in reading, and more per phrase in reading than in impromptu speaking. He pointed out that the pause differs in length materially from a fraction of a second to a time interval longer than a second. But a great deal more can be done to study the concept of phrasing and its relation to conventional punctuation signals.

While conventional punctuation marks may be adequate for the silent reader, they do not meet the need of the oral reader because (1) they do not always indicate important words the writer wanted emphasized, and (2) they often set off thought pauses that are not consistent with either line lengths, eye span, or breath groups.

In order to determine how closely conventional marks were being followed by expert readers, recordings of one hundred radio

⁸Tresidder, *Reading To Others*, 32.

⁹Waldo Abbot, *Handbook Of Broadcasting* (New York, 1941), 27.

¹⁰William G. Hoffman and Ralph L. Rogers, *Effective Radio Speaking* (New York, 1944), 191.

announcers were studied by the author. The script simulated the so-called "fill-in" announcement. It consisted of 282 words in 28 lines. (See copy below.)

The instructions suggested that each announcer follow the pattern he used when preparing copy for the air. If he ordinarily read the material "Cold"—that is, without previous rehearsal—he was to follow that particular method for this artificial script. If he ordinarily prepared the script by marking it or rehearsing aloud, he was to follow that approach before transcribing the script for this study.

The one hundred records were heard over a stroboscopically monitored play-back apparatus. The first time each record was heard for this study, it was timed. The second time the records were played, the script was followed and each time the announcer paused for breath, or seemed to combine a punctuation or emphasis pause with a breath, a mark was placed after the particular word where the pause occurred. The script used in this project follows. (The figures in parenthesis after a word indicate the number of announcers out of the total 100 who paused after a particular word. These figures come out also as percentages since exactly 100 cases were studied.) (The diagonal marks indicate the number of the lines on the copy of the script used by the announcers.)

The program (14) ordinarily heard from this station at ten o'clock/ (50) will be cancelled (56) in order to bring you a special broadcast (16) from/ the White House (11) in Washington. (100) From the Blue Room, (65) the President/ (3) of the United States (31) will address the nation (19) on a subject of great/ importance. (100) The Marine Band (7) will open the program (26) with the play/ing (6) of (3) the "Stars and Stripes (1) Forever," (96) after which (2) the President/ (14) will be introduced (31) by (1) the Secretary of State./ (100)

At this time (10) we wish to thank the sponsors (1) of "Coffee Time,"/ (100) Duke's (5) Jewelry Store, (92) and the Boston Hardware Company (94) for relin/quishing (1) their usual time (90) so the listeners of ——(station) (61) may hear/ (5) this highly important speech. (100) The "Coffee Time Singers" (25) will be/ heard tomorrow morning, (53) transcribed, (66) at nine o'clock./ (100)

It will be necessary (3) for us to (1) terminate our local (1) recorded/ (10) "Supper Time Melodies" (78) five minutes earlier (2) than scheduled (99) so the/ opening bars of the music (21) may reach you on time. (100) This follows/ our usual policy (20) of bringing you the public service features (82) when/ever they are of sufficient caliber (78) to warrant (1) their inclusion (41) in/ the daily log (5) of programs./ (100)

The (3) "Theatre of the Air" (14) will follow (3) on the regular time,/ (100) presenting one of the workshop productions (52) spe-

cially prepared (8) by/ our staff writer, (68) Mary Williams. (100) This evening's play (3) is titled/ (64) "Out Of The Night." (100) The cast of experienced players (32) is recruited/ from the same group (65) that has brought you the best (1) in literature/ for so many weeks. (100) The musical interludes (1) arranged for tonight/ (67) include (5) the favorite tunes (42) of all Americans./ (100)

This is ——(name of announcer) (40) asking you (1) to stand by for a/ moment.....(100) at which time (2) you will hear the voice (3) of (1) the master/ of ceremonies (68) in our nation's capital. (100)

One hundred of the marked sheets were studied. Naturally the announcers paused after periods. In most cases they paused after commas or other punctuation marks (i.e., dots after the word *moment*). There were many words which were not followed by pauses by any of the announcers. Four of the 100 announcers studied paused after the word *program*. The next spot for hesitation or breath was at the end of the first line on the word *o'clock*. Fifty paused here. Three words further on, after *cancelled*, 56 announcers paused; eight words further on, after *broadcast*, and before a long phrase beginning with *from*, 16 announcers hesitated. Eleven announcers paused before the next preposition (*in*) four words further on. No particular pattern seems evident. Some did not stop before either preposition; some paused for one; some for both.

The word *Washington* was followed by a period, and all 100 of the announcers honored it. They were consistent in pausing after all periods in the script. After the next phrase, four words long, there was a comma. Sixty-five announcers paused here. Six words further on, 31 announcers separated the phrase of the *United States* from *will address*. In this case, the phrase separated the subject of the sentence, *president*, from the verb. Seven of the announcers paused after *Marine Band*, thus separating the subject from the predicate by a slight pause. Since only three words had intervened since the period, this pause could not have been justified on the grounds of necessity for breath. Nearly always, parenthetical phrases or words are set off by pauses. Certainly the announcers honor the comma. Only rarely does one fail to heed its call to hold for a moment.

One of the longest groups of words without a break occurs at the beginning of the third paragraph. Fourteen words went by, before 78 of the 100 found it necessary to pause. Ninety-nine per cent paused five words later in spite of the lack of punctuation marks. A similar situation occurs in the next sentence. It contains 28 words without punctuation marks. Eighty-two of the announcers paused after the twelfth word before the conjunction *whenever* that splits the sentence into two clauses. Seventy-eight paused again before

the infinitive phrase beginning with *to warrant*. This point was six words further on in the sentence.

Sixty-one announcers paused after the call letters of their station (there was no punctuation); 40 announcers paused after pronouncing their own name (there was no punctuation here either). All of them hesitated after the series of dots after *moment*—a commonly used symbol for pause in radio.

The number of pauses for 282-word script varied from 25 to 57. The mean was 33.16. The mean number of words per phrase for the announcers was 8.5. The announcers seemed to pause at ends of lines more frequently than called for by the thought. Only 10 lines of the 28 lines ended without pause by any announcers; three of these were hyphenated words; two more ended with articles; three with prepositions.

There was practically 100 per cent agreement among the announcers as far as pausing after a period. However, no such agreement was apparent for the comma. There were eight commas in the script, but only 40 pauses were recorded for the 100 announcers. Thus 20 per cent of the time there was no noticeable pause after a comma. For the total number of scripts, 1,500 pauses were recorded where there were no punctuation marks. This indicates that the average announcer paused 15 times during this 282-word script without a particular conventional signal. Even when the pauses after proper names and obviously important words were subtracted, there were still some 8.38 pauses per announcer that occurred because of need for breath or interpretation.

The results of this study indicate:

1. Radio announcers do honor the conventional punctuation marks when they appear in the script. However, so many other places call for pauses that new markings should be devised to aid the reader follow the emphasis and thought the writer desired.
2. Radio announcers do seem to have a tendency to pause at the ends of lines a little more than mere consistency with punctuation marks and meaning would indicate. The writer should consider this fact when typing continuity. The end of a line might be considered an additional signal for pause—for breath or meaning.
3. If this study is an indication, radio announcers enclose approximately 8.5 words in the average "breath-group" or "thought unit."
4. Words that seem inherently important to the announcer seem to rate a pause for emphasis. (Examples are *program*, *president*, call letters of station, and name of announcer.)
5. If writers expect the oral reader to follow closely the pattern of thought they have envisaged, they must use new or added signals for reading.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE MEANING OF WORDS: ETC. By Alexander Bryan Johnson. Milwaukee: John Windsor Chamberlain, 1948; pp. xii + 256 (Intro. by Irving J. Lee).

This "new" book is really not at all new, but a reproduction of a publication printed in 1854. In his introduction Irving Lee points out that the author, Alexander Bryan Johnson, a Utica, N. Y., banker, was known to his contemporaries as, "the author of many books and a great student of Philosophy," and that, "... he was said to have been one generation ahead of his time intellectually."

Throughout Johnson's life he maintained a leisure-time interest in language, and *The Meaning of Words* appears to represent his accumulated observations on the subject. He recognized that his approach to language and meaning was unique, summarizing his work in the following words: "My efforts must be considered as mere inklings of a new analysis of language, attempted in the briefest manner compatible with an exposition of my design. I have opened a mine which contains much precious metal, but what I exhibit are only rude specimens of the ore."

It seems unfortunate that Johnson's influence was not more widely felt, for he seems to have been one of the first to approach language from the point of view later adopted in part by the proponents of general semantics. His basic approach may be revealed by his own words: "Four ineradicable fallacies are concealed in the structure of language: it identifies what unverbally are diverse, assimilates what unverbally are heterogeneous, makes a unit of what unverbally are multifarious, and transmutes into each other what unverbally are untransmutable." By a profuse use of examples and illustrations Johnson rendered his philosophical concepts palatable, although he readily acknowledged that his book was not designed for rapid reading.

This book is far more than a mere curiosity as an antique, and its usefulness is not limited to scholars alone. It is, rather, to be recommended as a reference for use in any serious study of the language. It would be difficult to find a work with more "modern" applications.

University of Virginia

JAMES M. MULLENDORE

THE RADIO ANNOUNCER'S HANDBOOK. By Ben G. Henneke. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1948; pp. 308; \$4.00.

From the point of view of the college or university teacher of speech and radio *The Radio Announcer's Handbook*, by Ben G. Henneke, is the best thing of its kind to appear in print so far. In spite of a number of major weaknesses, the book stands head and above two others on announcing: *Radio Announcing*, by Art Gilmore and Glenn Y. Middleton, and *Announcing for Radio*, by Bill Kilner. And it is considerably better than the brief chapters or paragraphs in the various radio textbooks.

Instructors will appreciate Mr. Henneke's comprehensive, though brief, coverage of his field, his organization, and his general approach to the

problem of communication via radio. The student should appreciate the way Mr. Henneke has outlined his material, reiterated major points, and summarized at the end of each unit. While the book actually contains only fifty-three pages of text, these pages are crammed with specific and concrete suggestions for the novice or for the professional announcer. Most writers on the subject of announcing write benignly and paternally in vague and abstract generalities.

Perhaps one reason why Mr. Henneke writes so much more convincingly and to the point than do other writers on the subject, is the fact that he knows from first-hand experience whereof he speaks, having had fifteen years' professional experience in radio as a vocalist, script-writer, actor, announcer, and producer. In addition to this background, Mr. Henneke writes from knowledge he has acquired during ten years as a teacher of speech. At present he is director of radio at the University of Tulsa.

Such a background, however, makes for a somewhat schizoid approach to the business of writing about radio announcing. When Mr. Henneke writes as a teacher of speech he is logical, concise, orderly, restrained, and objective. When he writes as a professional radio man he seems to fall into a stereotype and his ebullient promotional remarks are sometimes a bit hard to swallow without gulping.

The text material is divided into four chapters: "The Announcer's Qualifications," "The Announcer's Skills," "The *Ad Lib* Announcer," and "The Announcer's Work." The first and last chapters are not particularly noteworthy, but those on "The Announcer's Skills" and "The *Ad Lib* Announcer" are clearly good. In the section on pronunciation, Mr. Henneke recommends the use of the International Phonetic Alphabet for the beginning announcer and points out the inadequacies of other phonetic systems. The IPA is given in an appendix, but it is regrettable that the author did not use IPA transcriptions in his drill exercises which comprise the rest of the book.

The drill selections are well chosen and run the gamut of material the announcer is liable to encounter. The drill material, in addition to presenting the student with various types, styles, moods, and forms of announcing, purports to develop efficiency in the pronunciation of four foreign languages: French, German, Italian, and Spanish. It is doubtful if the average student will realize much in the way of attainment of this objective. Students have neither the time nor the inclination to memorize the guide-chart in the appendix for the pronunciation of foreign languages, nor are they likely, when preparing a drill exercise, to thumb back to the appendix chart to get the correct pronunciation for every syllable. One wonders if it wouldn't be more judicious to give interlinear International Phonetic Alphabet transcriptions of the material which is difficult to pronounce. This technique has been used to considerable advantage in the foreign language texts, and a similar idea has been used in the interlinear Shakespeare play publications of George Coffin Taylor, of the University of North Carolina.

The Radio Announcer's Handbook should be a welcome addition in the growing field of texts on radio broadcasting. It contains more than enough drill material (fifty-four exercises) for a one-semester three-hour course in

announcing. And it should prove to be a valuable supplementary book to introductory courses in radio and radio production.

University of Virginia

GEORGE P. WILSON, JR.

THE ADVERTISING AND BUSINESS SIDE OF RADIO. By Ned Midgley. New York: Prentice-Hall Co., 1948; pp. xi + 365.

Mr. Midgley has been teaching this subject at New York University and at the same time been serving as sales service manager of CBS. His book reflects this combination of the teacher's and the practicing commercial man's viewpoints. It omits most of the gratuitous self-congratulation often found in such books, even going so far as to suggest that not all the business practices of radio are beyond reproach. True, Mr. Midgley gives us a chapter of the usual tub-thumping statistics, such as the contrast between radio ownership and bathtub ownership and merchandising success stories. But since this kind of material is part of the salesman's stock in trade its inclusion has some justification.

Perhaps the most welcome feature of Mr. Midgley's book is the fact that it gets down to cases and gives concrete examples, not merely generalized from his own network, but ones fairly distributed over the whole field. Nor does he confine his attention to network sales. Local operations get due consideration, and spot sales are more fully treated than in any other text that comes to mind.

Useful illustrative materials include complete estimates of station costs for each network, using actual examples and showing all discounts; reproductions of actual samples of invoices, proof-of-performance affidavits, program logs, rate cards, etc.; and a break-down of network basic, supplementary, and bonus station groups.

Publishers still seem unaware of the fact that radio teaching has gone beyond the survey stage. They appear unwilling to risk books which frankly specialize in a specific technical phase of the subject. Accordingly, Mr. Midgley's book is embellished with several useless chapters fore and aft, apparently designed to insure its usefulness to the tyro student. These include chapters on "The American System," "Elementary Engineering Facts," "Television," and "Broadcasting Critics and its Future,"—chapters too brief to do any justice to their subjects and out of key with the highly competent and specialized major content of the book. Also on the negative side, may be added the fact that the index is very sketchy, containing mostly superfluous references to the already-alphabetized glossary of terms which precedes it.

Despite these minor flaws, *The Advertising and Business Side of Radio* should prove to be a useful text, not only for academic teachers of broadcasting, but for part-time teachers from the commercial field as well.

University of Miami

SYDNEY W. HEAD

SOUND GAMES, SPEECH CORRECTION FOR YOUR VERY YOUNG. By Alice L. Wood.

New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1948; pp. 103; \$1.50.

This book, according to the preface, is written with the purpose of assisting parents and teachers of young children in the correction of certain common speech defects. The book is composed of three chapters dealing with points to keep in mind if the child has a speech defect, two fundamental principles upon which the technique of correction is based, and sound games through which the therapy may be administered.

The three points to keep in mind, according to Chapter I, are: the child must be given the best possible speech patterns; if there is a physical defect in the speech mechanism it should be remedied if possible; and, since no child who has a speech defect ever hears his own mistakes, he will have to have ear training in order that he may distinguish between proper and improper sounds in speech.

In Chapter II, the author discusses two fundamental principles upon which speech therapy is based: first, the speech mechanism is largely automatic and should not be disturbed by drawing attention to its mechanics—in other words, speech therapy should be an indirect approach; second, “a learned reaction to a given stimulus tends to remain constant.” Hence, the problem confronting the teacher will be to teach the child to blend the correct sounds without introducing the old stimulus that would result in the incorrect blend.

Chapter III consists of games and drills to provide exercises for the correction of sound substitutions. There is a drill for each sound in the English language (sounds being written diacritically).

The reviewer feels that this book would be an aid to class room teachers and parents who are unfamiliar with the basic principles of speech correction, provided that parents and teachers are made aware of the importance of a thorough medical examination of the child before any speech therapy is attempted. The sound games and drills composing Chapter III would be a good collection for any speech clinician's files.

Southeastern Louisiana College

..... JOHN E. ROBINSON

